

of Red River and State of Texas, in place of Robert J. King. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1902.

John T. Cunningham, to be postmaster at Graham, in the county of Young and State of Texas, in place of John T. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Sumner W. Thompson, to be postmaster at Davis, in the county of Tucker and State of West Virginia, in place of Sumner W. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires April 21, 1902.

Henry G. Kress, to be postmaster at Manitowoc, in the county of Manitowoc and State of Wisconsin, in place of Henry G. Kress. Incumbent's commission expires May 24, 1902.

John C. Freeman, to be postmaster at New London, in the county of Waupaca and State of Wisconsin, in place of John C. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1902.

La Fevre Webster, to be postmaster at Ventura, in the county of Ventura and State of California, in place of L. F. Webster, to correct name.

Eli E. Starkey, to be postmaster at Seabreeze, in the county of Volusia and State of Florida, in place of Mary N. Herrick, removed.

George E. Buckman, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Beaufort and State of North Carolina, in place of John B. Respass, removed.

Josephine Chesley, to be postmaster at Bellville, in the county of Austin and State of Texas, in place of Frank P. Cumings, removed.

Sarah J. Hebson, to be postmaster at Sylacauga, in the county of Talladega and State of Alabama. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

Kate W. Kirkpatrick, to be postmaster at Decatur, in the county of De Kalb and State of Georgia. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

Robert S. Middleton, to be postmaster at Vienna, in the county of Dooly and State of Georgia. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

Arthur G. Clapp, to be postmaster at South Deerfield, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

Frank B. Williams, to be postmaster at Enfield, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

David S. Burt, to be postmaster at Byesville, in the county of Guernsey and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

Harrison Brown, to be postmaster at Watonga, in the county of Blaine and Territory of Oklahoma. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

Frank X. Roberts, to be postmaster at Manville, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 14, 1902.

SUPERINTENDENT OF MINT.

John H. Landis, of Pennsylvania, to be superintendent of the mint at Philadelphia, Pa.

COINER OF MINT.

Albert A. Norris, of Pennsylvania, to be coiner of the mint at Philadelphia, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 14, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 12, was read and approved.

BUSINESS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that next Monday be set apart for the consideration of business reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia instead of to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, this being District day, asks that next Monday, a week from to-day, be set apart for the consideration of business from the Committee on the District of Columbia. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MOBILE, JACKSON AND KANSAS CITY RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12452) granting to the Mobile, Jackson and Kansas City Railroad Company the right to use for railroad purposes the tract of land at Choctaw Point, Mobile County, Ala., and now held for light-house purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That in consideration of provisions hereinafter contained there is hereby granted to the Mobile, Jackson and Kansas City Railroad Company the right to build and construct wharves, docks, piers, and other structures for use in the operation of its railroad upon the tract of land at Choctaw Point, Mobile County, Ala., and now held by the United States for light-house purposes, and to lay its tracks upon and over said wharves, docks, and piers: *Provided, however,* That at least 300 feet of said wharves, docks, and piers shall be designated and set apart, subject to the approval of the Light-House Board, for the exclusive use of the United States for light-house purposes, which said wharves, docks, and piers so designated and set apart shall be maintained and kept in repair by the said railroad company, and the water approaches thereto kept dredged at the United States dredged channel depth without cost to the United States.

SEC. 2. That within fifteen days after the approval of this act the said railroad company shall file with the Secretary of the Treasury complete plans showing the wharves, docks, and piers to be constructed, upon which shall be designated the portion of said proposed wharves, docks, or piers to be set apart for the use of the United States as provided in the first section of this act, said plans, in so far as said wharves, docks, and piers are to be erected upon the lands of the United States, to be approved by the Light-House Board.

SEC. 3. That within thirty days from the approval of the plans as hereinbefore provided the said railroad company shall commence the construction of the said wharves, docks, and piers, and shall within five months from the commencement of the said work have completed and ready for use by the United States that portion of the said wharves, docks, and piers designated as hereinbefore provided for the use of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the United States shall have free access at all times across the tracks of said railroad company by the most convenient route, to be determined by the Light-House Board, for pedestrians, drays, and wagons, for light-house purposes, to the end of the wharf or pier designated as hereinbefore provided: *Provided, however,* That the United States shall have the right at any time, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, to take possession, for public purposes, of said tract of land and the wharves, docks, piers, and other structures so built and erected upon the land of the United States, and the United States shall thereafter make the said railroad company just compensation for the said structures so made upon the land of the United States by the said railroad company, and so taken by the United States, and said compensation shall be paid as soon as the amount thereof may be determined in the manner hereinafter provided. Should the Secretary of the Treasury and said railroad company be unable to agree as to the amount to be so paid by the Government, either party may bring proper proceedings in the circuit court of the United States at Mobile, in the State of Alabama, to ascertain and determine the amount of the liability of the United States: *And provided further,* That should the United States repossess itself of said land on account of failure of the railroad company to comply with the terms and provisions of this act, then the United States shall not be required to compensate the railroad company for said structures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have this bill debated before I determine whether I will object or not. I desire to present the facts to the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to its consideration now?

Mr. CORLISS. I desire to be heard on the bill.

The SPEAKER. If consent is given, it is open to debate, as the gentleman understands.

Mr. CORLISS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama a few questions.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. CORLISS. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that this land was purchased by the Government of the United States many years ago?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Seventy years ago.

Mr. CORLISS. For the purpose of giving the Light-House Board proper terminal facilities at this point?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. That is true. That was done seventy years ago.

Mr. CORLISS. And that Congress has authorized this railroad company to obtain this land, under a special act, by exchanging this piece of land for any other point or place upon the river acceptable to the Light-House Board.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. That is true. A bill was passed to that effect in 1896, and every effort has been made by the railroad company to make that exchange.

Mr. CORLISS. And is it not true that the Light-House Board have selected a point that will be satisfactory to them, and has not the railroad company refused to buy it?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. It is true that the Light-House Board selected a point, the value of which is said to be \$50,000, and the railroad is unable to buy that property and pay \$50,000 for it when this property in question here is estimated to be worth \$2,500.

Mr. CORLISS. Is it not true that the railroad company have failed to carry out the provisions of the prior act, but have gone on and built their road and prepared to use this very point for transportation purposes, ignoring the privilege extended by act of Congress heretofore?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. No; that is not true. The railroad company have made their plans and specifications for the purpose of submitting them to the Treasury Department, and they have been so submitted, and the Light-House Board and the railroad company have been before the Secretary of the Treasury, who has decided in favor of the railroad company and in favor of the commerce of the city of Mobile.

Mr. CORLISS. Is it not true that the Light-House Board have protested against the sacrifice of this property by Congress, demanding that it be reserved as a public necessity to them?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. My understanding is that the Light-House Board have not protested. On the contrary, the Light-House Board are under the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury has decided in favor of this bill. In fact, the bill as drawn is approved by the Solicitor of the Treasury and myself, and not only meets the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but has his hearty approbation.

Mr. CORLISS. Does not the gentleman admit that the Light-House Board reported to the Secretary of the Treasury emphatically against the provisions of the bill and the taking away of this property from that Board, but declared that it was necessary for their use?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Not in the language in which the gentleman puts it. The objections of the Light-House Board are presented to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury in his letter to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which reported this bill.

Mr. CORLISS. And did not the representative of the Light-House Board appear before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and there protest, in the presence of the gentleman from Alabama, against this bill in its present form?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. The representative of the Light-House Board appeared twice before that committee, and the committee reported in favor of the bill unanimously, after hearing both sides.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Speaker, I have been personally requested to let this bill pass. I do not wish to stand here objecting to the interests of the constituents of members upon this floor, but I desire to record the fact that this property was purchased years ago for the Light-House Board; that it is important for the Light-House Board to hold it; that the railroad company have come to Congress before this time and obtained an act authorizing them to exchange this property for another piece upon that river which would answer the purpose of the Light-House Board; that the railroad company have failed to carry out the provisions thereof, but instead have gone on in disregard of that act and constructed their tracks, depending upon getting control of this property by some other means than that provided in the former act of Congress.

And now, Mr. Speaker, they come here again and ask Congress to enact that this property shall be turned over to them so that they can use it for railway terminal purposes. Under the terms of this bill they will have entire possession of the property now controlled by the Government, and in consideration they simply give the Light-House Board, away out on the end of the pier, a small space for light-house purposes, wholly inadequate, compelling the employees of the Light-House Service to pass over the dangerous tracks of the company and over a long pier in order to reach their storehouse. I say to members on this floor that this bill ought not to become a law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

EVERETT HARBOR, WASHINGTON.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 56, providing for a modification in the adopted project for the improvement of Everett Harbor, Washington.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in carrying on the work of improvement of Everett Harbor, Washington, authorized in the river and harbor act of March 3, 1899, the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, postpone the dredging and improvement of Old River, and may widen or deepen, or both widen and deepen the harbor basin and channel through the tide flats, and take such steps as may seem to him desirable to protect and conserve the work as performed.

The following amendments recommended by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors were read:

In line 6 strike out the word "postpone" and insert in lieu thereof the word "abandon."

In lines 7 and 8, after the word "and," in line 7, strike out "may widen or deepen, or both widen and deepen," and insert in lieu thereof "any balance heretofore appropriated or authorized for the present approved project may be used for the widening or deepening of."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, there is another amendment, to make it more clear, which should be made in line 11, before the word "take," to insert the words "the Secretary of War may."

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 11, before the word "take," insert the words "the Secretary of War may."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BURTON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COURT-HOUSE AND JAIL, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY, ARIZ.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8752) authorizing the board of supervisors of Santa Cruz County, Ariz., to issue bonds for the erection of a court-house and jail for said county.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the board of supervisors of the county of Santa Cruz, Territory of Arizona, is hereby authorized to issue bonds on said county in the sum of \$5,000 for the construction of a court-house and jail for said county and vaults for the preservation of its records.

SEC. 2. That said bonds may be in such denominations as the said board may prescribe and shall bear not more than 5 per cent interest per annum, and shall not be sold for less than their par value. Said bonds shall be made payable in thirty years, with an option on the part of the county to pay any or all of them after ten years from the date of their issue.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of paying the interest on said bonds as it becomes due and provide for a sinking fund to pay said bonds the said board of supervisors shall levy and cause to be collected, as other county taxes are levied and collected, a sufficient tax on the assessable property in said county as will meet the interest as it falls due and provide a reasonable sinking fund to pay said bonds when due.

SEC. 4. That said bonds shall be printed with interest coupons attached thereto; each coupon shall represent one year's interest on the bond, and when the interest represented in a coupon is paid the coupon shall be detached from the bond and placed by the treasurer with his other vouchers before the board of supervisors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

UTAH SCHOOL INDEMNITY LANDS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13025) to make the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 23, 1891 (26 Stat., 796), applicable to the State of Utah.

Be it enacted, etc., That all the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 23, 1891, which provides for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated for other purposes, be, and the same are hereby, made applicable to the State of Utah, and the grant of school lands to said State, including sections 2 and 32 in each township, and indemnity therefor, shall be administered and adjusted in accordance with the provisions of said act, anything in the act approved July 16, 1894, providing for the admission of said State into the Union, to the contrary notwithstanding.

SEC. 2. That wherever the words "sections 16 and 36" occur in said act, the same as applicable to the State of Utah shall read: "sections 2, 16, 32, and 36," and wherever the words "sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections" occur the same shall read: "second, sixteenth, thirty-second, and thirty-sixth sections," and wherever the words "sections 16 or 36" occur the same shall read: "sections 2, 16, 32, or 36."

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Add at the end of section 2 the following: "and wherever the words 'two sections' occur the same shall read 'four sections.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McRAE. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if this bill enlarges the amount of the grant for school purposes for Utah in any way?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, sir; it does not enlarge the grant. Under the enabling act by which Utah was admitted into the Union, in view of the fact that it is a mountainous State, there was granted to it four sections for school purposes instead of two. It was found in a large number of instances the land was barren and mountainous, and was therefore valueless for cultivation.

Nine-tenths of our lands or more is mountainous and of practically no value except for grazing purposes, and for that reason it was recognized that Utah ought to have four sections of land instead of two. Under the act of 1891, which by this bill is made applicable to the State of Utah, only two sections are mentioned, because only two sections were granted the other States. This bill has been approved by the Commissioner of the General Land

Office and by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior, or the Commissioner of the General Land Office, concurs in the language of the act by which it was extended to cover the four sections instead of two.

Mr. McRAE. Then, if it does not enlarge the grant made by the enabling act, what does the State get by it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Simply as a matter of administration—

Mr. McRAE (interrupting). What is the substantial change in the law?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The act by which Utah was admitted into the Union provided for the selection of indemnity lands in certain cases. Now, that act was passed in 1894—

Mr. McRAE. I understand that; but there was also in the enabling act a provision for indemnity school lands. Now, what is the substantial difference between the two laws as to the selections?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was going to state to the gentleman that in the act of 1891 there is a provision, for instance, that where these school sections are within an Indian reservation that the State need not wait until the reservation is opened, but may select school-indemnity lands in place of them. There is a provision in the act that where the sections are missing, either in whole or in part, that indemnity lands may be selected for them. These two provisions are not in the enabling act of Utah, but are in the general act of 1891, so that the result is that every other public-land State may select indemnity lands where the school lands are either within the limits of a reservation or found to be missing by reason of some natural condition, like the existence of a lake, except in the case of Utah; and this simply makes applicable to the State of Utah the provisions that prevail as to the other public-land States.

Mr. McRAE. Is there not also another benefit your State gets by this bill? Is it not true that under the enabling act you must select your indemnity lands in not less than quarter sections nearest to the lands lost, whereas by this act you can take it in as small subdivisions as 40 acres?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not so understand it. If so I see no reason why Utah should be put upon different conditions from other public-land States.

Mr. LACEY. Is there not also this: You are required to select the lieu lands near by, adjacent to, instead of at a distance from the school lands?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am glad the gentleman from Iowa called my attention to that fact. Utah was constituted as a Territory something like fifty years prior to its admission into the Union as a State in 1896. The valley lands were settled throughout the Territory, as they were more valuable, and therefore the more valuable school lands had been taken up and settled upon. Now, under the provisions of the enabling act we must select lands as nearly contiguous to the school lands for which they are taken as we can possibly. Now, the same cause which induced settlement upon the school lands in the fertile valleys, because they were the most valuable lands, also induced settlement upon the adjoining valley lands, and when we undertake to select the most nearly contiguous lands to the school sections, for which they are taken as indemnity, we are driven into the mountains.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I did not catch the reason given why Utah did not get the benefit of these sections when admitted into the Union.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The reason was that in preparing the enabling act for Utah the gentlemen who drafted the bill took the provision from the enabling act of some State admitted prior to 1891, and overlooked the provisions of the act of 1891.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The question was taken; and the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SUTHERLAND, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present the conference report on the Post-Office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California presents the report of the committee of conference on the Post-Office appropriation bill, which the clerk will report.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, as there is a statement accompanying the report, I would ask that the reading of the report be dispensed with and that the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report and that

the statement be read. Without objection, this course will be pursued. The Chair hears none.

The report of the committee of conference is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11354) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 37, 39, and 40.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 29, 31, 34, 35, 36, and 38 and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Page 1, line 11, strike out the word "edition" and insert in lieu thereof the word "editions;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Page 4, strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Postmaster-General is hereby directed to investigate and report to Congress as soon as possible the advisability and practicability of purchasing and adopting a uniform metal lock box, at a price not to exceed 50 cents, for the purpose of selling the same to patrons on rural free-delivery routes at cost;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Page 4, line 24, strike out the words "less than \$100 nor;" and the Senate agree to the same.

E. F. LOUD,
GEO. W. SMITH,
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
Managers on the part of the House.
WM. E. MASON,
BOIES PENROSE,
A. S. CLAY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the committee of conference was read, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11354) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in the accompanying conference report on each of the Senate amendments, as follows:

The Senate made 40 amendments to the bill, producing a total increase of \$307,158.60. An increase of \$500,000 is made in the provision for pneumatic-tube service, \$45,100 in officials for the rural free-delivery service, \$55,000 for printing, binding, and distributing new edition of Postal Laws and Regulations, \$7,000 for two additional inspectors, and \$58.60 for claims.

By the action of the conferees the Senate recedes from amendments involving an increase of \$52,158.60.

The effect of the action of the committee on amendment numbered 1 is to permit the Department to have the new editions of Postal Laws and Regulations and Digest to accompany the same prepared for distribution and make available the amounts appropriated for such service in previous acts.

Amendments numbered 2 to 26, inclusive, relate to increase in force and increase in salaries of rural free-delivery officials, as follows: Increase in salary of special agents in charge of divisions from \$2,400 to \$2,500, and increase in number from 7 to 10. Increase in salary of clerks at division headquarters from \$1,200 to \$1,400 for the highest grade, and increase in number of 12 for all grades. Increase in number of highest grade of special agents from 15 to 30, and rearrangement of the grades so as to increase the salary of the lowest grade from \$1,300 to \$1,400. Increase in number of route inspectors from 75 to 85. The amount of per diem allowance was increased to meet the increases referred to. From all of which amendments the Senate receded.

The effect of the action of the committee on amendment numbered 27 is to strike out the provision inserted by the Senate directing the Postmaster-General to purchase rural mail boxes at 50 cents each and dispose of same to patrons at cost and insert a provision directing the Postmaster-General to investigate said subject and report to Congress as soon as possible the advisability and practicability of so doing.

Amendment numbered 28 provides for the prosecution and punishment of those who destroy or steal from rural letter boxes, and the action of the committee in respect thereto is to strike out the minimum fine for such offense.

Amendment numbered 29 permits special agents, route inspectors, and examining inspectors in rural free-delivery service to administer oaths, and is agreed to.

Amendment numbered 30 permits rural carriers to administer oaths, and the action of the committee is to strike out such provision.

Amendment numbered 31 makes the appropriation for printing facing slips, card slide labels, manifold books, etc., available for the registry service, and is agreed to.

Amendments numbered 32 and 33 are claims—one for carrying the mail on a certain route and the other for payment of a post-office order. They are both stricken out.

Amendments numbered 34 and 35 provide for the establishment of a pneumatic-tube service, and appropriate therefor for the ensuing fiscal year \$500,000, the Postmaster-General not being permitted, prior to June 30, 1904, to enter into contracts for this service which will aggregate an annual expenditure in excess of \$800,000. The provisions of this amendment are identical with those contained in a bill recently reported favorably by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads of the House, with the exception that the limitation of 8 inches for the diameter of the tubes is eliminated. Your committee have agreed to the amendment as incorporated by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 36 enables the Postmaster-General to pay the sum of \$1,000 to the legal representatives of railway mail clerks killed or who may die from injuries received while on duty, and your committee agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 37 provides for the extension of special facilities from Washington to Jacksonville, Fla., in addition to the provision providing for such service from Washington to New Orleans. The Senate receded on the same.

Amendment numbered 38 permits the Postmaster-General to have special-delivery and adhesive postage stamps manufactured in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing without advertising for bids therefor, and your committee agreed to the same.

Amendments numbered 39 and 40 provided for the appointment of two inspectors in the office of the assistant attorney-general of the Post-Office

Department and appropriated \$7,000 therefor. The Senate receded on the same.

The bill as it passed the House carried \$137,916,598.75.

The bill as it passed the Senate carried \$138,523,757.35.

The bill as agreed to by conferees carries \$138,471,598.75.

E. F. LOUD,

GEO. W. SMITH,

CLAUDE A. SWANSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman what the bill carries now for pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. LOUD. Five hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Speaker, I will make a statement to the House in regard to the only two amendments which are of much importance to which the committee agreed. You will note that the increase we have agreed to is about \$550,000 or a little over. Fifty-five thousand dollars is simply a reappropriation of money for printing the postal laws and regulations. Five hundred thousand dollars is for the pneumatic-tube service for the coming year, and in explanation of that I will state that the Post-Office Committee had under consideration the advisability and practicability of again permitting the use of the pneumatic tube in the larger cities of the country.

The opinion of the committee has been for some years that the service as established was of such an extravagant character that it should not be continued. We then took under consideration the question of so safely guarding the pneumatic-tube service, and recognizing, I believe, that the pneumatic-tube service, if it could be had reasonably enough, should be continued. We framed a bill and reported it to the House which provides that this service can only be instituted after due advertisement, and that such service should be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. We then provided that "no contract shall be entered into in any city for the character of mail service herein provided which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes and all other expenses of such service in excess of 4 per cent of the gross postal revenue of said city for the last preceding fiscal year."

There we put a limitation upon the extension of this service. To illustrate. If a city has receipts of a million dollars for the past fiscal year, then under this bill the pneumatic-tube service could be established providing for an expenditure of not exceeding \$40,000.

Further, we provide:

No contract shall be made in any city providing for 3 miles or more of double lines of tube which shall involve an expenditure in excess of \$17,000 per mile per annum, and said compensation shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses.

The tube that was operated in the city of New York, under contract entered into some five or six years ago, provided for an expenditure of about \$35,000 a mile, and your committee have limited it to \$17,000. Recognizing that pneumatic-tube service was an aid to the postal service, if it could be safely guarded, your conference committee took the views of the Post-Office Committee, felt authorized in receding from the amendment of the Senate, and recommending to the House that it be concurred in.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. As I understand it, the provision in the conference report is a limitation of \$17,000 per mile per annum. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the amount paid for the pneumatic tube in New York, when it was stricken out some years ago, was about \$35,000 per mile.

Mr. LOUD. A little over \$5,000.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. In addition to that, is it not a fact that a large amount of expenditure was made by the Government in providing for power?

Mr. LOUD. I am not positive about that for New York. The company furnished some power, and I think the post-office department some power in the main office.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman can not give me any accurate information on that point?

Mr. LOUD. The expense of power would not be more than fifteen or sixteen thousand dollars a year, and would not increase the service in New York to a large extent.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. My impression is there was an annual appropriation in the sundry civil bill providing for power for the pneumatic-tube service.

Mr. LOUD. There was in Boston.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. And there was also in New York. It comes to my memory now. Now, is it provided in the gentleman's conference report that the expenses for power shall be met by those operating the pneumatic tube?

Mr. LOUD. I believe that the committee have drawn this provision so it will cover every possible item. The committee

spent some time on this provision, and I will read it again. It is as follows:

That no contract shall be entered into in any city for the character of mail service herein provided which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service, in excess of 4 per cent of the gross postal revenue of said city for the last preceding fiscal year.

That no contract shall be made in any city providing for 3 miles or more of double lines of tube which shall involve an expenditure in excess of \$17,000 per mile per annum, and said compensation shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses.

I think we have covered as much as we could by language; at least, that is the intention. The same provision is in the next paragraph, which relates to the amount paid—

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I know it was proposed in the appropriation bill to build a new boiler for the purpose of providing power for the tube in New York. As I understand the gentleman, it would not be necessary to do that now.

Mr. LOUD. That is what the committee intended. There is one difficulty about post-office appropriations. We provide for one character of an expenditure, and another committee, of which the gentleman is a member, provides for other expenditures. Now, of course, if an appropriation committee shall provide for an expenditure of money for power, I do not think we could prevent it, although we have drawn this bill as carefully, I think, as it is possible to do it. I hope the Appropriation Committee will not attempt to make any provision to take care of any part of the pneumatic-tube service if it shall be installed as provided here.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] now in his seat.

Mr. CANNON. Let me ask the gentleman from California a question or two. The limitation proposed, as I understand, is 4 per cent. That is not much of a limitation, if the service extends for 2 or 3 miles.

Mr. LOUD. Four per cent in each city.

Mr. CANNON. What would it be in New York?

Mr. PAYNE. Not exceeding \$17,000 a mile.

Mr. CANNON. Ah! That is a very important matter.

Mr. LOUD. That is another provision.

Mr. CANNON. Does the provision which the gentleman has just read provide, substantially, that all expenses for power and everything else shall, in the first place, be limited to 4 per cent, and, in the second place, shall not exceed \$17,000 a mile?

Mr. LOUD. The provisions on this subject are embraced in two paragraphs, of which I have read only one. Another paragraph follows.

Mr. CANNON. Let us hear that.

Mr. LOUD (reading)—

No contract shall be made in any city providing for 3 miles or more of double lines of tube which shall involve an expenditure in excess of \$17,000 per mile per annum; and said compensation shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses.

Mr. CANNON. Then as to all cities that have 3 miles or more of tubes the limitation, as I understand, is conclusive; but if there should be a city that has less than 3 miles of tubes the \$17,000 a mile, as I understand, would not be conclusive.

Mr. LOUD. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to my friend from California that, in my judgment, he need have no fear of the Committee on Appropriations reporting anything not authorized by law in connection with this matter. We have not the power of legislation, nor would it be in order to appropriate anything not authorized by law.

Mr. LOUD. Sometimes things are "sneaked in," you know, when we do not see them.

Mr. CANNON. Sometimes they may be "sneaked in" from ignorance; but I say to my friend that he will search in vain, so far as I recollect, for anything providing for an enlargement of expenditure in connection with the public service that was ever "sneaked in" upon a bill from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LOUD. Sometimes things get in, and we do not understand them ourselves. Let me say to the gentleman that in three or four or five or eight or ten years if the Treasury Department should urge upon the Appropriations Committee the necessity of the enlargement of a plant or the expenditure of money in a Government building the gentleman might not discover what that expenditure was intended to do, and though not thoroughly understanding the subject might recommend an appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will confess so far, and so far only, that the Committee on Appropriations has from time to time reported legislation in connection with appropriations; but it has always called attention to the matter in the report, and never, so far as I have recollection or belief, has reported anything that took on additional expenditures. What little legislation the committee has reported in connection with appropriations has, I think I can safely say, been invariably along the line of a reduction of expenditures and a more economical administration.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody]?

Mr. LOUD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If I understand this conference report correctly, these limitations as to the payment per mile apply only where there are 3 or more miles of tube in operation?

Mr. LOUD. That is correct.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. But that will not cover Boston, where there are not 3 miles in operation.

Mr. LOUD. The committee spent a great deal of time on this subject, and we examined quite a number of witnesses. These provisions were prepared, I will say, in the Post-Office Department; but the Department, I think, would hardly recognize them now, because we have put around them every additional safeguard that we possibly could.

When we considered the rate to be paid per mile for a tube of less than 3 miles in length, the best evidence that we had convinced us that if a tube in a city was only half a mile or a mile in length, with two expensive terminals and with an expensive power plant, \$17,000 a mile was probably not sufficient. And again, we took into consideration that we must trust our officials. We can not lay down an iron-clad rule so strong that it will absolutely prohibit the initiation of service.

Now, let me say that so far as the city of Boston is concerned I believe the contemplated service there will cover much more than 3 miles.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If they get all they wish, it certainly will. In Philadelphia how much tube is there in condition to be operated?

Mr. LOUD. About a mile, I think.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Then this limitation under existing conditions will apply only to the city of New York?

Mr. LOUD. That is true, under existing conditions.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. And it makes the expenditure somewhat less than half what it was when the provision for this service was stricken from the bill.

Mr. LOUD. Of course, as I have suggested to the gentleman, we must depend upon the wisdom, the honesty, and the integrity of the Post-Office officials. If we do not or if we can not, we had better go out of business.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman on that point.

Mr. LOUD. We consulted quite freely with the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, who, as the gentleman knows, is not the same man who was filling that position when the former contract was entered into.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I have all confidence in him.

Mr. LOUD. I have faith in the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, from some association with him ever since he has been in that office. I have never found him yet conducting the affairs of that office in any other manner than that in which a good business man would conduct his own affairs; and as we could not apply the limitation where there was less than 3 miles of tubing in a city we have arranged it in the manner now reported.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I think this is a very important matter, and under ordinary circumstances I might have wished to have the question reserved for further consideration; but the House very well knows the great confidence I have in the gentleman from California and his committee, and if he desires to dispose of this matter now I will have nothing further to say. It is an important matter—the gentleman I know agrees with me on that—and the House can give very little consideration to it under these circumstances. I had hoped that the matter of pneumatic-tube service might come up in some other way than on an appropriation bill, so that there might be a full and free discussion and an opportunity for amendment; but I think, under the conditions which gentlemen all know, I shall make no further observations.

Mr. CANNON. There is one word I want to understand. I think I understand it now, but I want to emphasize it in view of the gentleman's statement a few minutes ago. In all cities now, as I understand it, that will have less than 3 miles of pneumatic tubes the limitations that the gentleman refers to do not apply; so that if at the next session of Congress or some future session of Congress estimates should be submitted for power outside of this limitation they would be in order under the law.

Mr. LOUD. Technically, I suppose that that would be true, yet I should hope that the Post-Office Department would take what appears to a reasonable mind to be a mandate; that so far as is possible the conditions laid down here shall be absolutely complied with.

Mr. BINGHAM. There will be no extension until 1904, anyway.

Mr. HULL. Does not the 4 per cent limitation apply to all offices?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, yes; that applies to all of them. In an office having receipts of \$1,000,000—and there are not exceeding 12, I think, in the whole United States that have receipts in excess of that—they could only expend \$40,000 for pneumatic-tube service.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Does this bill limit this to pneumatic-tube lines that are already in operation?

Mr. LOUD. There are none now in operation. I want to say, in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody], that if the House wants to discuss this matter it has the same opportunity here that it could have if we had disagreed to this amendment, because this is the only matter really upon which any question would arise. The House can dispose of it just the same. I do not want the House either to adopt or reject any measure that may be agreed to or disagreed to, coming from a committee of which I am a member, unless the House shall thoroughly and absolutely understand the question before them. Under ordinary circumstances, as one member of the committee on conference, I should not have agreed to this amendment upon an appropriation bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody] knows well my views upon this question, but neither he nor I can continually stand in the way of progress without continually being run over. I have done all in my power in the past.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we have stood in the way of progress, and we have not been run over up to the present time.

Mr. LOUD. Well, the gentleman and myself here tried to discontinue—

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. And succeeded.

Mr. LOUD. Tried to discontinue a pneumatic-tube service which was conceived in sin. The gentleman well remembers that.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I quite agree to that.

Mr. LOUD. We were run over then.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman had not my assistance then. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOUD. I think I have had the gentleman's assistance ever since the pneumatic-tube service has been in operation.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I recognize that the pneumatic-tube service is a service that we must have. The people in this country, in the large cities, demand it; and when we realized that condition, we safeguarded it as carefully as we could possibly frame legislation and make it effective. Now, there is the whole case. The House is in possession of all the facts, and the House can discuss it or dispose of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. I notice three provisions in this bill incorporated by the Senate—amendments 28, 29, and 30—which do not make an appropriation and which are administrative, and the report fails to show why those amendments were rejected. Two of them it occurred to me are quite important. One of them permitted the special agents to administer oaths, to swear witnesses, relieving them of the difficulty of carrying a notary public with them, for instance, when they are taking evidence. Amendment 30 provides that rural carriers may administer oaths to pensioners for their certificates. I suppose that was inserted because the rural routes frequently take away the fourth-class post-offices; and fourth-class postmasters, as I understand, have the right to administer oaths. This I assume was to take the place of that. I should like to know why that was discarded.

Mr. LOUD. Amendment 29 was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understood from the reading of the report that it was not.

Mr. LOUD. Amendment 30 was disagreed to. Amendment 30 conferred the power upon rural carriers to administer oaths, and we thought that was going a little too far. We permit the route inspectors and agents to administer oaths, but we did not think it advisable to confer that power upon an ultimate forty or fifty thousand rural carriers.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is a satisfactory explanation. I assumed that there was some very good reason that impelled the gentleman to reject the amendment. Why was amendment 28 rejected?

Mr. LOUD. Amendment 28 was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. I misunderstood the reading of the report.

Mr. LOUD. Amendment 27 was also accepted with an amendment.

Mr. CANDLER. I heard something in the statement which I could not exactly understand in reference to the amendment by the Senate concerning the boxes along these rural-delivery routes. They passed a certain amendment, and it was changed to some extent in the conference committee. Will you please explain what the provisions are in reference to that as the bill stands now?

Mr. LOUD. Amendment No. 27 directed the Postmaster-General to purchase lock boxes at a price not exceeding 50 cents

each and to sell them at cost to the patrons of the route. We amended that amendment by putting on a provision directing the Postmaster-General to report to Congress regarding the practicality and advisability of purchasing these boxes.

Mr. CANDLER. No further action will be taken in reference to these boxes until his report to Congress comes in on this subject?

Mr. LOUD. No; we did not consider it wise to adopt that amendment in the shape in which it was in the bill.

Mr. CANDLER. So the law will remain as it now is in reference to the boxes until that report comes in and Congress takes action in the premises?

Mr. LOUD. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. LOUD. If no other gentleman desires to ask any further question, I will ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LOUD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ROBERT J. SPOTTSWOOD.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7018) for the relief of Robert J. Spottswood and the heirs of William C. McClellan, deceased, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendment and that a conference be asked for.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. GRAFF, Mr. FOSTER of Vermont, and Mr. OTEY.

GEORGE C. TILLMAN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 4071) granting an increase of pension to George C. Tillman, with a House amendment thereto to which the Senate had disagreed and asked for a conference.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I move that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, Mr. BROWELL, and Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.

RECIPROCITY WITH CUBA.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 12765, to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba, and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for general leave to print upon the bill for three days after the final vote upon it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 12765, and pending that asks unanimous consent for general leave to print on this bill, lasting for three days after the final disposition thereof. Is there objection?

Mr. APLIN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan objects.

The motion of Mr. PAYNE was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, the bill pending before the House may be considered in two aspects—from the purely business standpoint of an economic measure in the interest of the commerce and industries of two nations, and from the standpoint of those weightier considerations of a high political and moral character. If the bill were even more important to this nation as a purely business proposition than it is, it would hardly deserve the great place it has taken in the public mind and in our own deliberations; and yet from that point of view it is of considerable importance.

It fixes the basis upon which is to be conducted the trade between two peoples, which to-day amounts in the aggregate to seventy-five millions a year, and which I believe, under the operation of the bill, would soon amount to more than three times that sum. It contains advantages to both nations without doing injury to either, as a whole, or to any interest in either. One party to the transaction is so strong and rich that even a greater benefit would hardly be perceptible, although the bill is in the direction of a sound national policy of great importance even to it, but to the young and now weak people—hereafter, I trust, to be prosperous and great—it comes as the very bread of life.

Let me call your attention to the general features of our trade with Cuba without reviewing the details. A glance at the figures of that trade will, I think, show the lack of accuracy in the observation of the gentleman from Nevada, who is usually accu-

rate, that the trade which the bill would secure for our country would be in those articles which are produced by the trusts. The table of imports into the island of Cuba, which I hold in my hand, will prove the gentleman's error.

In the first subdivision, which bears the title of "Alimentary articles," Cuba in the year ending June 30, 1901, imported from the United States \$3,789,320 of value, and from all other countries \$12,924,071 of value. I do not know of a single article which enters to any material extent in that list which is under control of a trust. They are articles of food or drink, and the far greater part of them in value are the direct products of agriculture or the products of our fisheries. I would say that the preferential duty which is called for by this bill would probably secure to this country much the greater part of the thirteen millions of trade which under that item goes to other nations.

The next important heading embraces fibers, tissues, cotton and other clothing, boots and shoes, and wearing apparel generally. In that subdivision the total value of goods purchased from the United States amounts to only \$1,127,160, while from all other countries there were purchased \$10,186,029. Under the heading of "Miscellaneous," the most important item of which is cattle, there were purchased from this country \$2,347,009, and from all other countries \$6,772,868. The grand total of all articles contained in the exhibit of this portion of Cuba's trade amounts to \$10,356,725 of goods purchased from the United States, and \$34,930,183 of goods purchased from all other countries.

It is practically certain that instead of having such a small percentage of this trade, under the operation of the pending bill this country would secure 80 per cent of it all. That is a most important item in itself. It embraces, not as has been said—the products of the trusts—but it embraces in a great degree the products of our agriculture, our fisheries, and our common manufactures. Instead of selling, therefore, to Cuba about \$30,000,000 of goods each year on the basis of her trade of the last fiscal year we should, under this bill, be selling her about \$60,000,000. This is a trade that will enormously increase with the growth of the population and the prosperity of Cuba. In the present impoverished condition of that people they must be content with the bare necessities of life. If they are prosperous their consumption of the articles entering into their trade will greatly increase.

The objection to the bill which has been urged with the greatest force, and indeed the only one that can command our attention, is that its passage will be attended by an injury to a new and growing American industry, which would otherwise have before it a great future. If that objection were a sound one it would be fatal to the bill. I for one certainly could not see my way clear to support a measure which would throw a growing American industry to the wolves for the advantage of any other industry, however meritorious, in our own country or for the advantage of any other nation.

I am sure I should be the last to injure knowingly the beet-sugar industry, which has prospered so splendidly in Michigan, and which promises so much for the whole nation. I have no criticism to make of the Representatives of the States in which that industry is established, although I feel confident that they are mistaken in their belief that this bill would bring any harm to their industry.

I have listened to the eloquent speeches of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, and of others who are upon this side of the Chamber, and share his views upon the subject, and I have been entertained even if not convinced by their efforts. They have read to the House from Republican platforms and the speeches of prominent Republicans declarations in favor of protecting the beet-sugar industry.

The sentiments they have quoted are all highly interesting but hardly pertinent to this debate. They tend too much to generalities. They proceed upon the theory that when the Republican platform, for instance, of six years ago declared in favor of protection to beet sugar it meant to declare in favor of 1.685 cents a pound, no more and no less, although that rate was not determined upon until a year afterwards. There is no question here of protection to the beet-sugar industry, certainly upon this side of the House.

I believe Republican members are unanimous in their desire to foster that industry. I think it should be supported, because we have such large areas in this country where the soil and climate are favorable to its development that after a few years of protection we shall be enabled to produce, at a less price than we are paying now, sufficient sugar at home to supply our own consumption. Even under the discouraging circumstances of the last year, when the overproduction, caused by a system of bounties abroad, created an abnormally low price, the output of our beet-sugar factories increased about 100 per cent.

The question, I say, therefore, is not whether we should protect the beet-sugar industry, but what would be a sufficient protection

and whether it could be harmed by this bill. Will the reduction of the duty upon raw sugar coming from a single country to 1.35 cents a pound in the slightest degree endanger that industry? If gentlemen would address themselves to that proposition, they would discuss the question which long ago struck me as the vital one in this case. In my opinion the evidence is conclusive, not merely that which was produced before the committee, but that which springs from the very nature of the case itself, that the beet-sugar industry would not be weakened at all.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman believe that by any possibility the beet-sugar industry can compete on equal terms with cane sugar grown in the Tropics?

Mr. McCALL. I think so. I am coming to the general question between cane and beet sugar later.

The situation is so clear that I question whether the fright which has been so conspicuously displayed since this agitation began is anything more than a mere simulated and theatric fright. I shall cite to the House a few figures bearing upon the cost of producing beet sugar, from the highest beet-sugar authority, and then leave it to determine what possible danger there can be from the proposed reduction upon Cuban sugars. The beet-sugar forces are led by an able political general, as well as one highly accomplished in the business of manufacturing sugar.

Mr. Oxnard has been engaged in manufacturing beet sugar for about twelve years. After he had been nine years in the business, when he could speak from practical experience instead of mere theory, he stated that with beets at \$4 per ton and an expense of working them of \$3 per ton, there would be produced 250 pounds of sugar, the estimated amount from a ton of beets, for \$7, and upon that expenditure of \$7 for raw material and for labor the manufacturer would receive, at 4 cents per pound, \$10 for the finished product, a profit of 43 per cent upon the cost of the labor and the material employed.

He said that in a factory which was in operation the cost of working the beets was less than \$3 a ton and that in a proposed new factory the cost would be below \$2 a ton, but for the sake of conservatism he adopted the estimate of \$3 a ton. So that upon this estimate, which after nine years of experience in the business he declared to be conservative, there was this great profit to pay for the general expenses of the business and for dividends, although he was reckoning the finished product of refined sugar at only 4 cents a pound.

Now, take this estimate as a starting point, that refined sugar could be sold within the area of the beet-sugar country at 4 cents a pound with this great margin to cover depreciation and interest. Let us see at what price Cuban sugar, estimating upon the basis of the cost of its production, can be placed in that area. Colonel Bliss, our collector at Habana, has made a special effort to ascertain the actual cost of producing sugar in Cuba, taking, I think, eight different plantations, and he arrived at the conclusion that that cost is 2 cents a pound.

Mr. E. F. Atkins, a great business man who has been engaged in manufacturing sugar in Cuba for many years, and who has shown the same grade of capacity in that business that Mr. Carnegie has displayed in the steel business, and who is intimately acquainted with the conditions in Cuba, said to the committee that the average cost of producing sugar in Cuba was $2\frac{1}{8}$ cents a pound. While Mr. Atkins was an interested witness, he was perfectly frank with the committee, and as between him and Colonel Bliss I should accept his testimony because of his more intimate personal acquaintance with the facts.

But I will take here Colonel Bliss's estimate, for the purpose of my comparison, and shall consider the average cost of producing sugar in Cuba without any profit to the producer as 2 cents a pound. This bill proposes a duty of 1.35 cents per pound upon Cuban raw sugar. That would be equivalent to an ad valorem duty, taking the actual cost of production as representing the value, of 67½ per cent. I know that some of the friends of beet sugar have displayed a sensitiveness when we mention an ad valorem duty.

They say that the Republican party has always denounced ad valorem duties. As a matter of fact, the duties enacted by the Republican party are largely ad valorem, and the objection which its members have urged against the ad valorem can not apply in this instance, because here the duty is specific; it must be so much per pound. There is no danger of undervaluation or of fraud upon the American Treasury or the American producer. There can be nothing odious in translating the specific duty into the equivalent ad valorem duty.

If, as some gentlemen who apparently never saw Cuba contend, sugar can be produced there at less than 2 cents a pound, then it is obvious that the equivalent ad valorem will be greater than 67½ per cent; and if the estimate were correct of a cost of 1½ cents a pound, which to my mind is a ridiculous estimate, then the duty proposed by this bill would be about 110 per cent of the

cost of producing Cuban sugar. I propose, however, to follow the statement of our collector at Habana and estimate the cost of production at 2 cents a pound.

A great deal must be added to this—the freight and shipping charges from Cuba are about 0.35 of a cent a pound. That would bring the cost in bond in New York to 2.35 cents a pound. Now, if to that you add the duty proposed by this bill, the cost of transshipment, and the freight to the territory which the beet-sugar manufacturers naturally supply, you have 4 cents per pound, at the very lowest calculation, or a practical protection of 100 per cent, upon the cost of producing raw sugar in Cuba. Then, adding the cost of refining, you would get not merely 4 cents for your sugar in the beet-sugar territory, which, according to Mr. Oxnard's own estimates, would enable him to make 43 per cent upon the cost of labor and raw material expended, but would have at least 44 cents a pound.

I know Mr. Oxnard retreated somewhat in his testimony before the committee from the estimate which he made in 1899, but he admitted that the average cost of making refined sugars in his factories had been 4 cents a pound, so that in either event there would be for the refined product a very substantial profit indeed. Two cents a pound is a price which will not stimulate production in Cuba at all, because there is no motive for men to enlarge their production of an article which it does not pay them a profit to produce.

Should the price of sugar increase so that the Cuban would get more for his crop and therefore be encouraged to produce more sugar the American purchaser of Cuban sugar would have to buy at a higher price obviously than to-day and the protection accorded the beet-sugar industry would be correspondingly increased. I have proceeded upon the assumption that the world's price of sugar is the Habana price and that the protection of our producer would be simply the amount of duty that we added against Habana sugar. But the case is obviously stronger than that.

It is admitted by practically everybody upon both sides of this controversy that the world's price of sugar is the Hamburg price. We shall consume in this country during the present year about two and one-half million tons. Of that amount practically one-third is produced upon American territory, substantially another third will be brought from Cuba, and the remaining third or the great mass of about 800,000 tons must be purchased in the world's market.

So long as there is a considerable deficiency in our production the price for sugar in New York will be the Hamburg price, with the full freight and the full duty added, and the effect of remitting 20 per cent of our present duties to Cuba will be to add that much to the value of the products of Cuba.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The gentleman from Massachusetts will recall that Colonel Bliss in his statement before the Ways and Means Committee said that the Cuban planter would not get but 30 per cent of that.

Mr. McCALL. I am arguing now what I think will inevitably follow from the plainest economic principles, and I would like to have the gentleman, if he will give the House the pleasure of listening to him hereafter, show why a planter in Habana should sell his sugar for any less there than he could get in New York after he pays the freight and shipping charges to New York.

So that our beet-sugar producer would receive the full benefit of the protection of 1.685 cents per pound until such time as our consumption would be substantially supplied by our own product and by that of Cuba, a condition that can not possibly occur during the life of the proposed measure, or that there would be any reason to apprehend could occur if its life were protracted for ten years.

The testimony of the beet-sugar men themselves shows clearly that the proposed reduction upon Cuban sugar would not lessen the price of sugar to the consumer in this country in the least. If not, how could the beet-sugar industry be injured? Let me quote from Mr. Oxnard upon this point, because Mr. Oxnard was very specific. In his testimony before the committee, found on page 179 of the record, he said:

I do not believe that a small reduction of the tariff would reduce the price one penny to the consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you call a small reduction?

Mr. OXNARD. Why, 10 to 20 per cent.

And 20 per cent is the amount of reduction proposed in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it reduce the price to the consumer?

Mr. OXNARD. I do not think it would reduce the price of sugar to the consumer, because you would have to go abroad to get such a large quantity of your raw material that the price of refined sugar would be fixed there plus the duty.

That is an unqualified admission of the principle underlying this entire case. So long as there must be a great mass of sugar bought by us in the world's market in addition to what we get from our own producers and from Cuba, the price of sugar in the central market of the United States will be the Hamburg price

plus the freight plus the full duty. That can not be denied. It is admitted by the leader of the beet-sugar forces, and with that admission the whole case of a direct injury to the industry goes by the board.

But at this point the gentlemen interested in beet sugar become the guardians of the public and say that if the duty is reduced upon Cuban sugar the sugar trust will get the benefit of that reduction, and they do not propose to consent to any such a wicked transaction. This doctrine has the merit of novelty and implies the discovery of a new trait in human nature. It is in effect that a soulless corporation will as a rule pay one set of men more for a given article of common use than it could buy the same article for at the same time and in the same place from another set of men.

I think that it can be asserted without any unreasonable presumption that sugar of the same grade will at any given moment of time bring the same price in New York Harbor, providing it is handled by rational beings. Of course, the owner of any commodity is liable to be buncoed, but as a general proposition either buyer or seller will take advantage of the conditions which exist in his favor. I do not understand that anyone has ever claimed that there would be two ruling prices for sugar in New York at the same moment of time.

That being true, it would follow as a general proposition that the parity of price would be substantially maintained between ports having intimate trade relations with each other, like New York and San Juan and Hamburg. My eloquent friend from Minnesota has simply been quarreling with an axiom when he has taken the contrary position. It requires no long arithmetical computation on the floor of this House to disprove the proposition so obviously at war with one of the deepest principles of human nature.

Why should the owner of sugar in Porto Rico accept a less price in San Juan than he could get by shipping his sugar to New York? Why, again, does not the sugar trust get the benefit of the whole duty as against the producer of raw cane sugar in Louisiana—because that producer is said to have no other market? Of course the scarcity of sugar at one port—compared with the demand, the distance to the port of supply, and the temporary scarcity of freights, and considerations of that nature—will produce slight deviations from the parity, but these exceptions only prove the rule, and the infinitesimal divergencies which the ingenuity and the diligence of the gentleman from Minnesota led him to think he had discovered between New York and San Juan prices would only prove the rule if these divergencies, as a matter of fact, had existed.

The proposition of the gentleman is contrary to all the laws of trade and to all the laws of human nature. There will be one price for the same grade of raw sugar in New York at the same time, whether you pass this bill or whether you do not, and whether or not you pass it the Cuban planter will be able, if he has ordinary human sagacity, to get that price whenever he enters that market. Whatever obstacle you remove from his course in entering that market will inure to his advantage. I well remember that two years ago it was repeatedly asserted that the removal of the duties upon Porto Rican sugar would inure to the benefit of the sugar trust.

There were some of us who did not share that opinion, although I will admit that there were very few of us upon this side of the House, but I call to your attention the result of the experiment that we then tried, and I assert with absolute confidence that the result of granting free trade to Porto Rico has been that the Porto Rican sugar grower, and not the American trust, got the benefit of the removal of the duty. I think, therefore, it is entirely clear that there is no ground for the alarm which the beet-sugar interests display at the pending bill, and the case is so clear that, in my opinion, as I have previously said, that alarm is affected.

They have consistently contended from the start that the great octopus, the American sugar trust, was forcing through legislation here to stifle and crush its growing rival.

I do not think it is exactly fair to discredit the cause of Cuba by bringing in the sugar trust or by holding up the sugar trust as the beneficiary of this legislation. Of course we understand that the sugar trust is a bogey that it is always safe to batter, but I do not think that in the consideration of an economic question we should be frightened from looking at the facts as they are in the light of economic principles.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does the gentleman understand that the sugar trust favors or opposes this legislation?

Mr. McCALL. Upon that point I do not understand whether they favor it or oppose it. I venture to say as a practical proposition that every member on this side of the House has received 10 pamphlets and 10 documents against this bill from the friends of beet sugar where he has received 1 pamphlet or 1 document from the sugar trust in its favor.

I for one decline now, as I did two years ago, to be frightened

from the calm consideration of an economic measure by this conjuring with the octopus. The methods advised by some advocates of the beet-sugar industry in this particular connection do not commend themselves to my judgment. Having elected to consider the sugar trust, instead of the President, instead of the governor of Cuba, instead of the Secretary of War as the essential promoter of this legislation, some advocates of beet sugar propose to take off all the protection upon the business of converting raw into refined sugar in this country if they are compelled to accept the slightest reduction from the enormous protection which they themselves receive.

Now, I am not wasting any sympathy upon the sugar trust. I do not know whether the business of converting raw sugar into refined sugar is so established in this country that it can get along entirely without protection or not. If it could get along without protection and prosper, then we should have the sturdy competition, I am glad to say, of the producers of beet sugar; but if it could not get along and thrive, I say the people of this country are vitally concerned in having the business of the independent refining of sugar conducted in this country and not be turned over to the tender mercies of a highly-protected industry like that of beet sugar.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to interrupt the gentleman to ask him a question in that connection.

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. How many persons are there employed now in the refining of sugar—I do not mean of beet sugar, but the cane sugar—in the United States?

Mr. McCALL. I do not know. I can not give the exact number.

Mr. HEPBURN. The number is very small, is it not?

Mr. McCALL. I am not familiar with the exact number. You are speaking, now, of the number of concerns and not the number of men?

Mr. HEPBURN. No; I am speaking of the number of men employed in the industry of the refining of cane sugar or of imported sugar.

Mr. McCALL. I do not know, I would say, how many men there are employed.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have seen the statement that the refining process costs 1 mill per pound. Is that correct?

Mr. McCALL. I think that is probably very incorrect. I think that is probably something like the statement which has been made that sugar could be produced in Cuba at a cent and a quarter a pound.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was testified before the committee, if the gentleman will permit me, that of the 1 cent additional charged by the sugar-refining company about five-eighths was the cost of refining and about three-eighths of a cent was profit.

Mr. McCALL. I understand that the cost of refining is something in excess of one-half cent, but I will admit that I am not competent to answer the gentleman upon that point.

Mr. METCALF. It was stated before the committee that the cost of refining was about half a cent a pound.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. The gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] has reversed the figures. As I understand, the testimony was that the cost was three-eighths and the profit was five-eighths.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; the testimony of Mr. Post was that the cost was 62½ cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him? In answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH], I will say that on page 395 of the testimony Colonel Bliss stated:

I think the most of the Cubans to whom I have talked agreed with me that if you were to give 50 per cent off, or 33½ per cent, or whatever you give, probably not more than 30 per cent at the very most would go to the planters, and the rest of it, whatever did not stay in the United States, would go to the laborer and the colono, the man who cultivates small fields of cane.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. That is on the supposition that his wages would be increased.

Mr. McCALL. Of course, that would increase the cost of producing sugar over the estimate made by Colonel Bliss; but I do not know of anything that is peculiar in the production of cane sugar that would have any worse effect upon human nature than the production of beet sugar. I do not think there is anything in the beet that would give men an immunity from that spirit of gain that prevails in all kinds of trade. I do know that the German beet-sugar cartel, which sells sugar for export at 2½ cents a pound and extorts 6 cents a pound from the German people, is something compared with which the American sugar trust, however wicked it may be, is an eleemosynary institution, and I prefer, and I think the people of this country prefer, to have the business of independent refining maintained in this country.

Now, if it can get along without any protection at all, all well and good; but I would suggest to the gentleman that there are people living in this country at a great distance from the beet,

who do not regard that vegetable as sacred, and that they will not look with complacency upon a great protected industry like that with 67½ per cent, if it is to submit to the slightest reduction attempting in revenge to strike the protection entirely off from another competing industry.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts certainly does not propose to compare either the cartel or the bounty produced sugar of Germany with the beet sugar of our own country.

Mr. McCALL. I was not making any comparison except to this point, that some gentlemen engaged in the manufacture of beet sugar in Germany are robbing the German people; and now the gentleman goes on the theory that the beet-sugar people of this country are not going to get all they can out of their trade, that they are benevolent and charitable gentlemen, and that we have nothing to fear from them.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Has the gentleman ever heard any complaint about the sugar schedule until somebody wanted reciprocity with Cuba?

Mr. McCALL. Any complaint about the sugar schedule?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes; complaint that it was too high—the tariff on sugar. I have heard complaints about other schedules—hides, steel, glass, and several other things—but I had never heard any complaint about the sugar schedule until we got ready for reciprocity with Cuba.

Mr. McCALL. I never heard any special complaint about the sugar schedule.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I never heard any.

Mr. McCALL. Of course there is always a general hue and cry about the differential, and there is also a general complaint about all tariff duties from which the sugar schedule is not exempt.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The differential is ample, is it not?

Mr. McCALL. Undoubtedly it is ample. I do not understand that anyone is asking for an increase. I say it may possibly be susceptible of reduction, but I say the gentleman would not be in a very noble and unselfish attitude if, representing an industry that has this enormous protection, which it is proposed possibly from his point of view to cut down slightly, he should say that he would cut down all the protection upon this other industry.

I suggest to the gentlemen that they are adopting neither a sound nor a safe method of legislative procedure when they propose, if their own protection in the case of a single country shall be reduced to 67½ per cent, that they will remove all protection from a competing industry.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Did not the debates both in the Senate and the House at the time the bill was passed expressly show that the rates were fixed on raw sugar and refined so as to build up the beet-sugar interests of this country?

Mr. McCALL. Undoubtedly. That question has been discussed here. I am not making an effort to give all the arguments and all the evidence in the particular speech I am making.

The climate and soil of Cuba are highly favorable to the growing of cane, and they are favorable to a great many other crops. It is significant that it was urged on behalf of the tobacco growers who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means that a reduction of the duty on tobacco would enormously stimulate its production in Cuba; that new lands would be given over to it, and that our own producer would be swamped. That prospect is about as reasonable as the fear that Cuba is going to rush into the production of sugar when it would cost her 3½ cents a pound to get the raw product into our market, a sum which is in advance of the price she receives at present. Certainly they can not produce tobacco and sugar from the same land at the same time.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will my colleague permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does not my colleague believe that the testimony shows that, with reasonable encouragement in the treatment of Cuba, in a very short time it can produce at least two or three million tons of sugar annually?

Mr. McCALL. Cuba, if she went to the full extent of her production, could at least produce—

Mr. TAWNEY. Not the full extent, but in the next five years.

Mr. McCALL. I do not think that there is anything that would be called testimony that would establish that proposition. I have no doubt that if you encourage it something might be done, but not enough to make it formidable. They raise tobacco and sugar, and they could not raise both tobacco and sugar on the same land at once.

Mr. TAWNEY. Let me ask my colleague this question: Is it

not a fact that all the witnesses conceded that at least within five years Cuba could, with free sugar, produce all the sugar that the United States consumes?

Mr. McCALL. I do not think all conceded that within five years that could be done.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him this question? Has the gentleman heard anyone state, either in the House or in the committee, that the production of sugar would be substantially increased during the next year, the period for which this bill is to run?

Mr. McCALL. Why, certainly not. Under the present prices there is no inducement to the people of Cuba to increase their crops, unless we suppose that they are going to extend the production of an article which they are now producing at a loss. They certainly could not greatly increase their crop during the life of this bill.

A recent writer has pointed out the partnership between sugar and slavery and how the monarchs of a few centuries ago would compare their ships freighted with sugar to the bees laden with the sweetness of the fields. The sugar, however, with which they were familiar was tropical or cane sugar. One member of the copartnership has gone. Slavery has practically vanished from the earth. A new industry has come into being. As a rule, when both beet and cane sugar are produced by free labor, beet sugar has the advantage.

As Mr. Oxnard has said, sugar is essentially an agricultural product. Fitted as we are for agriculture, and able to compete successfully with the whole world in the production of those things to which our soil and climate are adapted, the producers of America need have no fear of producing sugar against the world when their industry shall be established. With the abolition of the indirect bounties abroad and with the enormous protection of 1.68½ cents upon every pound of sugar, it is preposterous to suppose that our sugar producers can not maintain themselves in our markets.

What will the beet-sugar people do in the case of the annexation of Cuba? Suppose our agents there have after all told the truth? Suppose the present low price of sugar shall produce financial disaster, failure, distress, and want in Cuba, and that disorder ensues, and that this country may be compelled to take her in order to bring about her regeneration? What will become of the beet-sugar industry then? I confess it is hardly a satisfactory answer which gentlemen give to that proposition, to say to us grandly that we will face that crisis when we reach it.

It is a simple question: What will the beet-sugar industry do if Cuba is annexed? It will not meet the point to say that they will then have to produce sugar under a protected market and with severe anti-immigration and anticontract-labor laws, because the provisions of this bill will put upon Cuba, if she shall assent to them, our own contract-labor laws and will put her under our protected markets, so that practically all her supplies bought from other nations will be purchased in this market.

If our beet-sugar industry can not hold its own with Cuba with a specific duty equal to 67.5 of the cost of Cuban production, what will happen when Cuban sugar has absolutely free access to our market? The great threat to the sugar industry of this country does not come from this bill, but it will come from a failure to pass the bill. It will come from a condition which makes annexation necessary. Viewed, therefore, simply from its economic aspects as a measure to promote international trade, I think it is entirely clear that the pending bill will be for the interests of both countries and will injure no class of people in either nation.

As to the future of cane sugar in the United States, I can see little ground for optimism. It seems to me it can not stand beet-sugar competition at home when that industry shall be developed. People who are engaged in that industry, if they take a far look ahead, will prepare to use their fields for some other purpose. Cuba is one of the few countries in the world where cane sugar can be raised in competition with the beet sugar of other nations. They need only to plant their cane on the average once in every ten years.

In Louisiana it must be planted every two years at a cost, as was testified, of \$20 an acre. It is a rational application of protection to develop those industries which we are by nature fitted to carry on, but a mere exotic industry which we are not fitted to carry on and which must be maintained by a perpetual tax upon the American people is something that does not come within any proper application of the doctrine of protection.

If the soil, the sunshine, and the air of Cuba will do work for the American people which those same natural agents refuse to do in our own country, it would be the grossest kind of waste for us to refuse to accept the benefit of those blessings and forever to put upon poor human nature the burden of doing the work which nature herself would do for us with her lavish hand. We have enough of avenues for the profitable employment of labor without

taxing ourselves to maintain industries which can never be profitably maintained.

But there remain what, to my mind, are vastly the most important considerations underlying this bill, and those are the considerations of equity and duty which are involved, and also, I may add, those considerations of a high political nature which have reference not merely to some particular industry in this country or to our pecuniary interest, but to the future of the American commonwealth. The important reasons for this bill are those which rest upon moral obligations.

In our resolution which led to the Spanish war we absolved ourselves from the guilt of that war by calling upon mankind to witness the unselfishness of our motives, and we declared, first:

That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

And, fourth:

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

There was no equivocation in our attitude. We went to war for the purpose of freeing Cuba, and declared that she was, and of right ought to be, free and independent; and we declared our purpose, as soon as the island was pacified, to leave the government and control of it to its people. One year ago when the pacification of the island was advanced, and the question arose as to the withdrawal of our troops, we passed the Platt amendment. I was one of those who thought that amendment scarcely compatible with the lofty declarations with which we embarked upon the war; but gentlemen with as keen a sense of national and personal honor as my own thought otherwise.

At any rate it was passed and it declared itself to be in fulfillment of the declaration which we had made with reference to the future of Cuba. It was not passed, therefore, in forgetfulness of what we had promised, but it was declared by us to be our interpretation of that solemn promise. Now, what did we say? We provided that Cuba should either insert into its constitution, or in an ordinance appended thereto, certain declarations. I will advert to the more material ones in connection with this bill:

I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which may impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization, or for military or naval purposes, or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of the government, shall be inadequate.

III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

V.

That the government of Cuba will execute and, as far as necessary, extend the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defence, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

Now, gentlemen tell us that this leaves Cuba absolute freedom to make treaties of trade with other nations. Bear in mind that we have, right under our eyes, one illustration of the manner in which we have construed a promise made to the Cuban people. Look upon the Platt amendment as our interpretation of what the Teller resolution meant, and is there a gentleman upon this floor who would contend for an instant that Cuba could freely make a treaty with Germany or any other power by which that power would secure her trade as against us and that that transaction would go unchallenged by us? Treaties are not always kept when they are made between nations.

Suppose Cuba should make a treaty with Germany and she should not keep it. The rights accrued under that treaty might call for a display of force. How could that be made under the Platt amendment? What nation that did not wish to invite a quarrel with the United States, having in view the Platt amendment, would care to make such a treaty with Cuba? Suppose,

again, that the trade should not, in our judgment, leave the Cuban government sufficient revenue to carry it on. Should we not intervene? There can be no doubt about it, that as practically construed Cuba, under the Platt resolution appended to its constitution and now a part of her organic law, falls in all international matters under the absolute predominance of the United States.

Will gentlemen assert that we have discharged all our obligations to Cuba when we set her out upon the highway of nations thus gagged and bound hand and foot, and that all that remains is for us hereafter to sing praises to our own virtue for making her nominally free? We have put ourselves under obligations which we can not disregard.

How have we treated the other islands wrenched from the sovereignty of Spain? We have given 25 per cent concessions to the Philippines, although they are at the other side of the globe, and not one American in a thousand ever heard of them before the war broke out.

We have given free trade to Porto Rico, which is a thousand miles away. But it is said they are a part of our country. But our Government has taken the position, in which I need hardly say I did not concur, that they were not entitled as of right to free trade with the United States, and that we had the power to determine in each instance what, if any, concessions should be made.

How does Cuba's case stand in equity compared with that of the Philippines? Cuba is at our doors. She guards a great stretch of our coast, the mouth of the Mississippi, and the Isthmian Canal. It was her cause that stirred the hearts of the American people. She is a part of us, not by the harsh fiat of war which, in defiance of the laws of nature, sets up an artificial and unnatural relation with incongruous peoples who live under another sky and who are not so far separated from us by the space of half the planet which divides us as by those more ineradicable differences in institutions, in race, and in civilization, but she is a part of us by those common interests which bind peoples together.

I know it is commonly said that destiny decrees that she should some day become an integral part of the American Union. Destiny is too often a mere synonym of unhallowed greed. For my part, I prefer to have her go on and flourish as an independent republic rather than to have her take a part in the Government of the people of the United States. Under the protection of this nation in foreign affairs, with the instability of the races which inhabit her, regulated and tempered by people of American birth, whom prosperity will attract to her in large numbers, I think she can flourish as an independent government in a way that will make her the model of the other Latin-American States. But if she is ever to become a part of us, it is far better that she should enter as a prosperous and contented member than through the door of starvation.

But I do not care to see the governing agencies of our great nation extended any farther toward the Tropics. Let me read to you from the utterance of a famous writer who unites the far-sighted vision of the historian with the sound judgment of the statesman. In a book just issued Prof. Goldwin Smith asks the question: "Does the white man in his overflowing philanthropy want a burden?" And then he proceeds to answer it:

He has it at his own door. If he is a member of the British Parliament, let him step out into Whitechapel or Houndsditch, or let him read the White Slaves of England, and see how in his own country the alkali worker, the nail maker, the slipper maker, the wool comber, the white lead maker, the chain maker live. In the United States the white man has a burden such perhaps as no other nation has been called upon to bear. * * *

To the black population of the Southern States is apparently soon to be added the black population of Cuba, while even the white population is not American or truly republican in character. Should expansion pursue that course, Santo Domingo and the West Indies, with their black millions and their alien civilization or barbarism, will probably be annexed. The Isthmian Canal will act as a lure to expansion on the continent southward.

The slave owners' dream of an empire extending south may thus be practically fulfilled. What, then, will become of the American commonwealth? One of two things apparently must ensue: either a radical change in the character of the nation and in the spirit, if not in the form of its institutions, or a second disruption. Have expansionists looked ahead? Have they made up their minds what direction their expansion shall take, and considered, if it takes a southern direction, what is likely to be the effect? The decision can not safely be left to traders, who are apt to care little for national character or for anything but the immediate extension of their trade.

If we are to have Porto Rico and Cuba and other tropical countries with their incongruous populations admitted to participate in the government of the American commonwealth, we must be prepared for a radical change in the character of our institutions. For the sake, then, of our own future, as well as for the sake of that new-born republic, let us pass this bill. Whatever the faults of the Cuban people, we must all admit the great patience and serenity with which they have acted during the last three years.

Let us now set them upon their course as a nation with the help and the encouragement contained in this measure. That little republic is the child of this great nation, sprung from her loins, and she appeals to our highest interests, to our tenderness, to our sense of justice, and to that high sentiment that makes

men respond to the call of duty, and I trust that such an appeal will never be made to this Republic in vain. [Loud applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. VAN VOORHIS having taking the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. CROOK, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On April 12, 1902:

H. R. 10363. An act to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station on Ocracoke Island, on the coast of North Carolina.

On April 11, 1902:

H. R. 6918. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bliss.

RECIPROCITY WITH CUBA.

The committee resumed its session.

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BRANTLEY. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege some days ago, upon the floor of this House, to speak at considerable length in favor of Cuban reciprocity. I advanced at that time the reasons appealing most forcibly to me in behalf of freer trade relations between Cuba and our country. I have no desire now to repeat what I then said, but inasmuch as the pending bill has been completed and reported to the House since that time, and inasmuch as the arguments against reciprocity have become more well defined, I desire now to briefly supplement what I have already said, with some additional remarks on the subject.

The pending bill is not satisfactory to me in the small concession it makes to Cuba, and in the conditions it imposes upon her, nor does it contain as much tariff revision as I would like to see, and if I am given the privilege of doing so I shall vote to amend it, but if it can not be amended I shall vote for it in its present form, believing that it does offer some relief to Cuba and does tend toward freer trade relations between that island and the United States.

The situation in Cuba that demands relief at our hands has been so clearly stated so many times that I do not deem it necessary to more than briefly mention it now. The causes that have brought about this situation are twofold: In the first place, the bounty system so long in vogue in foreign countries, reenforced by the cartel, has so stimulated the growth of beet sugar that there is not only now an immense overproduction of sugar in the world, resulting in the reduction of the price of sugar to an abnormally low figure, but the cartel and the bounty system enable the foreign producer of sugar to put his sugar upon the market and sell it at less than the cost of production, a thing utterly impossible for the Cuban producer to do. The second cause of Cuba's present condition arises from the impoverishment of her people, growing out of her last war for freedom. Our own statistics show that her wealth has been reduced 75 per cent, and the facts show that fully three-fourths of her people are directly or indirectly dependent for a livelihood upon her sugar industry.

It necessarily follows, therefore, that for her to market her present crop of sugar, amounting to some 850,000 tons, at a price below the actual cost of production means absolute ruin and bankruptcy to her people, already overwhelmed with debt, as they have absolutely no means by which they can recoup themselves for the loss thus entailed upon them. It means not only ruin for the present, but for the future, as there will be no means with which to make the next crop and no inducement to make it. These people have appealed to the United States to aid them, not by making any donation to them, but simply by giving them the benefit of the markets in the United States for their products at a living price. It has been well demonstrated that the United States can do this, and do it by the loss only of a small portion of her large surplus revenue, and substantially without any injury to any producers in the United States.

The only question presenting itself to us is whether we shall grant this relief, and thereby extend our trade relations, or shall we refuse it, because, upon the one hand, it is claimed to be un-Republican to grant it, and, upon the other hand, claimed to be un-Democratic to grant it. In my judgment, the American people are not so much concerned in knowing whether or not the pending bill is un-Republican or un-Democratic as they are concerned in knowing that it grants sufficient relief to Cuba.

It seems to me that gentlemen who speak of Cuba and refer to Cuba as a foreign country are not entirely accurate. Cuba is not a foreign country to us in the sense that every other country not a part of our system is foreign. She is not foreign in the sense of distance, because she lies at our very door; and neither is she foreign in the relations that she bears to this country, which are such relations as no other country in the world bears to us. The

concessions that she has made to us of parts of her sovereignty, which give us a certain supervision and control over her actions, and the concessions that she has made of valuable rights to us, make her, if not substantially a part of our system, at least one in whose welfare we are directly interested.

Gentlemen flippantly speak of the proposition to relieve Cuba as being purely sentimental. They might with more force have referred to the war that we waged for her freedom at a sacrifice of blood and immense treasure as being based upon sentiment. The truth is, however, that the justification for the war, as well as the justification for the proposed relief, is founded upon something more substantial than sentiment. The war between Cuba and Spain affected us in many material ways. It interfered with the rights of our citizens. It interfered with our trade. It was expensive to us. Among other expenses, it entailed the necessity of patrolling our coast to overtake *The Three Friends*, the *Dauntless*, and numerous other boats, charged with carrying contrabands of war to Cuba.

It interfered with us in many other ways, and it was this interference with our substantial interests, as well as a humane desire to confer freedom upon Cuba and to end the cruel and devastating war within her borders, that furnished the justification given by our Government for intervention. We have greater interests now to protect in Cuba than we had then. We have more interest now in seeing a stable and independent government in Cuba than we had then. And yet when it is proposed now for us to protect the substantial interests we have in Cuba by making a slight concession to her in our tariff rates, in order that she may live, a thing we can do at a tithe of the cost the war brought upon us, the proposition to do so is slightly referred to as being purely sentimental.

The avowed purpose and intention of the United States Government ever since the Spaniards were driven from Cuba has been to establish there a stable and independent government, as it was in duty bound to do. This "stable and independent government" is to take charge of the affairs in Cuba during the coming month, and the authority of the United States is to be withdrawn at that time. Will our purpose have been accomplished or our good faith maintained or our duty performed if we withdraw from the island and leave it to the care of a government bankrupted before it begins? Do we not run the risk in so doing of necessitating another speedy intervention upon our part, and one that will cost us far more than will a trifling concession now in our tariff rates? Is it mere sentiment or is it business sagacity that seeks now to provide against such a contingency?

Is it mere sentiment that seeks to give Cuba a stable and independent government, one that can maintain its duty and its obligations to its own citizens and to foreign countries—the performance of which duty and obligations we have practically underwritten—or is such effort the part of ordinary business caution and prudence, to say nothing of self-protection? Men might fill volumes with talk about this legislation being founded solely upon sentiment, but they could never convince me that I am actuated solely by sentiment in my desire to see Cuba given a government able to maintain and enforce the present sanitation laws of that island so as to protect the people on our Atlantic and Gulf coasts from the invasion of yellow fever, and this is but one of many things highly important to us for the government of Cuba to do and perform.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that when Cuba wrote into her constitution the Platt amendment, and when she granted to us every concession that we asked of her, she became entitled to ask us in return not to leave her upon the same footing, in her commercial dealings with us, that all other countries dealing with us are placed. Good faith to her requires that a different treatment should be accorded her from that accorded to other countries who have made no such concessions to us. Not only does good faith require a different treatment of her, but the protection of our own interests, both in the island and in our own country also, require this different treatment of her to the end that she may maintain a stable and independent government.

The Government of this country, Mr. Chairman, has in operation a high protective tariff system. I am not responsible for the establishment of this system, but the fact that I am not responsible does not blind my eyes to the existence of the system. Cuba knows and feels the effect of it, and our own people know and feel the effects of it. Cuba has no money with which to pay bounties to her sugar producers and has absolutely no way by which she can put herself in position to compete with the bounty sugars of Europe, and if our tariff laws will not let her into our markets except at a loss, her only alternative is to starve.

If there was any other country in the world other than ours to which she could go and form an alliance, offensive and defensive, for the protection of her commerce, we have prevented her from doing so by the conditions we have exacted from her, as I have heretofore demonstrated. Does not every instinct of American

justice, therefore, demand that we grant her simple request that she be not treated as strictly a foreign country, but that she be permitted to come just a little way within the circle of the protection that we have set up for our sugar producers against the bounty sugars of Europe?

Gentlemen say, however, that they can not support this bill, because its purpose is not to reduce prices to American consumers. If they mean by this contention to argue that this bill does not purport to reduce the price of sugar 20 per cent to our consumers, while reducing our tariff to Cuba 20 per cent, then their contention is well founded, but their argument is all at fault. If simultaneously with the reduction of the duty to Cuba a similar reduction was had upon the price of sugar in this country, then Cuba would derive no benefit from the reduction and the purpose of the bill would fail entirely.

The bill is designed primarily to relieve Cuba; and if that purpose fails, then the bill must itself fail. Our people, however, are benefited by the concession made in the increased trade that they will enjoy with Cuba, both in exports and imports, the figures concerning which I stated in my former remarks. In this way we will derive as much benefit from the reduction or more than Cuba will derive, and, in addition, we will hope to enjoy the peace and security and protection that will come to us and our interests by a stable and independent government in Cuba.

Other gentlemen say that they can not support this bill because it imposes upon Cuba the requirement that she shall adopt a protective tariff for her people. The only trouble about this argument is that it is unfounded in fact. This bill does not require Cuba to adopt any kind of a tariff different from that which she already has and which is admitted to be a purely revenue tariff, and it must also be admitted that she could substantially increase her present tariff and the same would still be a tariff for revenue only. The bill only requires that Cuba shall make a difference in her tariff rates to us of not less than 20 per cent as against her rates to the most favored country.

If she elects to maintain her present tariff and reduce it 20 per cent to us, she will comply with the conditions of this bill; but if, in lieu of doing this, she prefers to increase her present tariff, still giving us a 20 per cent concession, she will still have complied with the bill. In other words, she is left free and untrammelled to impose whatever kind of a tariff it is her pleasure to impose. I certainly am not in favor of requiring her to adopt a protective system, nor am I in favor of saying to her that she shall not do so. Neither am I in favor of saying to her that her present tariff, one framed by our military government, is too sacred to be touched or changed by her.

I think she should be left free and independent to have just such tariff laws as she desires, and this bill gives her just that kind of freedom and independence. The truth is gentlemen are very much in error who construe this bill to make anything in the nature of a demand upon Cuba so far as her tariff is concerned. The bill really grants to Cuba the prayer that she has made in that regard. It was her own proposition to reduce her tariff rates to us in return for a reduction of our rates to her, and this bill merely gives her the privilege of doing what her representatives and delegates have time and again said they wished the privilege to do. It is the granting of a request and not the making of a demand, and grants a concession that Cuba can accept or reject just as she pleases.

But gentlemen tell us we should not allow Cuba to make any tariff concession to us because there are other trusts than the sugar trust and these other trusts would be benefited thereby. If this be sound logic and good statesmanship, the conclusion is forced upon us that none of our producers, none of our manufacturers, and none of our people can look forward to an extension of their foreign markets or to any concessions for their benefit that our Government may be able to obtain for them in any foreign country, because whatever extension of trade or concession comes to our country it will have to be shared in by all our people, whether in or out of a trust. I am not prepared to deny an advantage to my constituents because some other man's constituents will be benefited thereby, nor am I prepared to refuse relief to Cuba in the only rational way it can be given because in the relief given her a benefit accrues to my people in which other people in whom I am not interested to help will share.

It is also argued, with a zeal to be commended but a judgment to be deplored, that the effect of this bill will be that all the benefit of the reduction made will go to the sugar trust, and at the same time that our sugar producers will be ruined, and if not ruined seriously injured. Both of these contentions can not be true, and one or the other of them must fail as a matter of logic, while both of them will probably fail as a matter of fact. The only possible way for the sugar trust to receive the full benefit of the reduction in this bill will be to have the present price of sugar in this country maintained, and, if the price is maintained, then none of our sugar producers can possibly be affected. It is inter-

esting to note also that if our sugar producers are affected by a reduction in the price of their product, then more than 99 per cent of the American people will be benefited, because more than 99 per cent of them are sugar consumers as against less than 1 per cent of sugar producers.

Gentlemen who are so solicitous that the sugar trust shall receive no benefit from this bill also lose sight of another very important fact; and that is, if it should unfortunately prove true that the benefit in this bill intended for Cuba goes to the trust, the people of this country will nevertheless receive the full benefit of reciprocal trade relations with Cuba, and the people who will be most hurt by this perversion of justice will be the poor Cubans.

As to whether or not the trust will get the benefit of the reduction in this bill appears from all the statements to that effect that have been made to be purely speculative. It is only an opinion that may or may not prove to be well founded. The facts about the matter are that to-day if Cuban sugar is put upon the market in New York it will command the market price, and out of that price the Cuban producer will pay the tariff amounting to 1.685 cents per pound, and what he has left will represent the price that he gets for his sugar, out of which, of course, he has to pay all other charges. If to-morrow the tariff rate is 20 per cent less than it is to-day, it seems to me that the Cuban producer is bound to pay out of the price received by him 20 per cent less for tariff duties, and that the difference in tariff duties paid represents that much saved by him.

If any different result is to follow, it would necessarily require that on the same day, in the same market, for the same sugar, there shall be two separate and distinct prices, which, to my mind, is an absurdity. It is an established fact that Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands have received the benefit of the reduction in the tariff made to them; and if they have received it, why not Cuba? So well pleased are the Hawaiian Islands and Porto Rico with what they have received that they are to-day protesting against any tariff concession to Cuba. Judging the future by the past, and that is the only way we can judge it, the argument all seems to be in favor of the Cubans receiving the benefit of the reduction in this bill, if it becomes a law. Certain it is, to my mind, that we can not refuse to-day to make the tender of help to Cuba in the only practical way offered to us through fear of a possibility that that help may not reach her.

As I have previously demonstrated, however, if the trust should devise a way by which it can rob Cuba of the relief contained in this bill, then Congress has the power to correct this great wrong by removing the differential on refined sugar, and, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to deprive the trust of any possible power to rob Cuba by removing now this differential on refined sugar.

Gentlemen also talk about this being a bill aimed solely at reducing the tariff on agricultural products, and offering nothing in compensation for the reduction to the agricultural classes. The answer to this suggestion, in brief, is that this bill is not a 20 per cent reduction of the tariff on anything. It is a 20 per cent reduction only on the goods coming from one country, and leaves the tariff on these same goods coming from all other countries exactly as it is to-day.

The reduction that is made is not limited to agricultural products. The bill makes a reduction on everything that Cuba has of 20 per cent, and in return provides that Cuba shall make a 20 per cent reduction on everything that we have. The bill therefore is in no sense limited to agricultural products at either end of the line. The reduction being limited to Cuba, and all that Cuba has to sell not being sufficient to supply our home consumption, it necessarily follows that the prices received by our producers will continue to be fixed by the price of the importations that come from countries other than Cuba and against which the full tariff rates are imposed. It also follows that the reciprocal advantages to come to us by the concession in the Cuban tariff must go to all our people and that no one class or classes will be singled out to be benefited in preference to others.

It was argued for a while that the sugar trust had already bought all of the present crop of Cuban sugar and for this reason that the effect of this bill would be solely in the interest of the sugar trust. Governor-General Wood, however, has furnished information as late as the 7th of this month, which has been read upon the floor, showing that an official inquiry instituted all over the island reveals the fact that only an exceedingly small part of the present crop has been sold to anyone, and he advises, upon the strength of his information, that the Cuban planters will get the full benefit of the reduction made in this bill, so that this argument can no longer be insisted upon.

It has been stated upon this floor that the rate of duty that we impose upon sugar is about the amount of the world's price of sugar, so that our present tariff schedule on sugar compels the American consumer of sugar to pay practically twice the price for his sugar that he would have to pay if this tariff did not exist. In other words, the American consumer of sugar is taxed 100 per cent

on the sugar he consumes in order to protect our sugar producers. Notwithstanding this enormous tax that the American people are paying the real purpose of this bill is not to reduce this tax, because its purpose is primarily for the relief of Cuba and not for the relief of the American consumer. The tendency of such reduction, however, is in the interest of the American consumer; and when Cuba's crop increases to sufficient size to supply or approximately supply American consumption, the effect of the reduction, if then in existence, undoubtedly would be to reduce the cost of sugar to the American consumer, and, in my opinion, an occasional reference in this House to the rights of the American consumer, against whom all protective tariffs are laid, ought not to be out of order.

So much, Mr. Chairman, for the several arguments against this bill, predicated upon the merits of the bill itself. Other arguments of a purely political nature have also been made prominent in the discussions we have had. I have so far endeavored to discuss the bill from a purely nonpartisan and American standpoint. I have done so because I regard the question involved as concerning the good faith, honor, and fair dealing of the American Government in its relations both with Cuba and its own people, and one that should be considered from an American rather than a party standpoint.

Gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber, however, have asserted—and I assume they considered the assertions necessary to their arguments—that this bill is in strict accord with the Republican doctrine of protection, while other members upon that side, equally able and equally loyal to their party, have asserted in effect that the bill undermines every principle upon which the doctrine of Republican protection is founded. They also charge that this bill marks the opening of what they are pleased to call the red path of tariff reform. Other gentlemen have been led to tell us that the bill is both un-Republican and un-Democratic, and so long as it is defeated they are willing to exculpate both parties from any responsibility for it. These discussions concern me but little, because they throw no light upon the merits of the question and ignore entirely Cuba's need for relief and the duty of this Government to grant it.

In view of what has been said, however, upon both sides of this Chamber, I ask the privilege to refer briefly, as a Democrat, to the political phases of the question before us as they present themselves to me. I know, and regret to know, that among my colleagues on this side there are Democrats, able, just, honest, and loyal to their party, who oppose this bill, some upon one ground and some upon another. I have no admonition, no lecture, no quarrel to offer them. I am content that in this matter they shall be guided by their consciences, as I am guided by mine. Perhaps it would have been better—I think it would have been better—to have eliminated politics from this discussion. They have been brought in, however, and I think it only proper that I should express myself from that standpoint.

I wish to say that reciprocity, a proper reciprocity, one that is established by the Congress, and not merely by the President and Senate, and one that gives freer trade relations between our country and another country, has no terrors for me as a Democrat. It was just such reciprocity that Jefferson declared for, and it was this reciprocity that the Democratic platform of 1892 declared for when it said:

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith.

It is true that this platform condemned, and properly condemned, not reciprocity, but the "sham reciprocity" of the McKinley law. The reciprocity of the McKinley law was in restraint of trade, and not in favor of its enlargement. It was aimed as a retaliatory measure to trade that existed, and not as an invitation to an increased trade. The McKinley law placed sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides on the free list, and the reciprocity feature of the McKinley law only authorized the President to take these articles off the free list if their free introduction was found to be "reciprocally unequal and unreasonable;" and, further, it limited all reciprocal trade relations to countries producing the said agricultural articles so placed on the free list.

The pending bill, however, calls for a horizontal reduction of 20 per cent on everything in both this country and in Cuba, and if this is not a recognition of the principle of true reciprocity I am at a loss to define the word. It is not full reciprocity, but it is a percentage of it and sustains the principle. It is a reduction on everything, with no discrimination of the one thing against the other. It means enlarged trade for our country and less restrictions and greater privileges for our trade.

It seems to me that these things are and have been the aim of the Democratic party, and for my part I can not decline to accept freer trade with one country because I can not get it still freer, and because I can not get it freer with all countries. If ever we are to have freer trade generally there must be a beginning. A beginning is now offered, and as I can not get more I will accept it.

I beg to suggest that if the Democratic party stands for tariff reform, for tariff revision, and for tariff reduction, as I have been taught to believe that it does, that it is not clear to me how the party's position on these great questions will be made plain and manifest to the country if we, as a party, here refuse to vote for this bill, it being the only bill before this body with a single atom of tariff reduction in it for which we can make our votes effective. It is not clear to me how we can sustain ourselves by refusing to accept a slight concession in the tariff upon the ground that we can not obtain a complete concession.

In voting for a slight reduction of the duty on sugar I am not ready to believe that it is undemocratic to vote to reduce the highest schedule in the highest tariff in the history of our country.

When Democrats stood upon this floor two years ago, and I was among the number, and contended against the adoption of the Porto Rican tariff, I did not think that our discussion was purely academic. I thought that results, as well as principles, were involved in that discussion. I thought that the tariff and all of it and any part of it was hurtful to the Porto Ricans, and for that reason, as well as for constitutional reasons, should not be imposed. I believe that the recent imposition of a large percentage of the Dingley tariff rates against the Philippine Islands is both wrong in principle and hurtful in effect upon these islands. A reduction of these rates would be beneficial to them, and so a reduction to Cuba will be beneficial to her, and I believe that the greater the reduction the greater the benefit.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that those who are responsible for this bill and stand sponsor for it disclaim that it even hints at tariff revision or tariff reform, but are we to determine what the bill is by the name they give it or by an inspection of the bill itself? I dare say that no leader of the Republican party, in the present frame of mind of that party, would call any bill reported by him to this House a tariff-reform measure. Therefore, of necessity, we must look to the terms of any bill reported in order to determine what it is, and an examination of the bill now pending before the House, no matter by what name they call it, shows, by its express terms, that it provides for freer trade relations between the United States and Cuba, and freer trade is the main contention of all tariff-reform advocates. It may well be asked, after such an inspection, how does it happen that a bill reducing tariff schedules and freeing trade comes from the high priests of protection? We are taught to beware of the Greeks bearing gifts, and there are those exceedingly skeptical of any good thing coming out of the Republican Nazareth.

To my mind these suggestions form the most interesting phase of this entire question. If this bill was really a protective measure, if it was intended to still more tightly bind the American consumer with the coils of protection, it is pertinent to ask, Why has the Republican Ways and Means Committee waited four long months before presenting it to the House? The President made the demand upon them for some such legislation the first of last December. The urgency of such legislation, so far as Cuba's good was concerned, existed then. It was pointed out that sugar shipments would be ready in December, and that ordinarily all sugar shipments from Cuba would be over by the 15th of March, and that whatever was done for Cuba's good should be done without delay.

Notwithstanding the urgency of these appeals, and notwithstanding that Cuba's condition was daily growing worse by the piling up of her interest accounts and the stagnation of trade, this bill granting some relief was not brought before the House for consideration until the 8th day of April, more than four months after the House convened. Can any Democrat explain such delay upon the part of the Republicans in reporting a purely Republican measure if this measure answers to that description? If this bill is in strict accord with Republican doctrines, and if it marks no departure from Republican principles of protection, why did the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee lack the courage to report it without first submitting it to the Republican caucus? If it breathes nothing but the doctrine of Republican protection, why was it that the Republican members of this House spent night after night in sweat and turmoil in their caucuses in the effort to find enough votes upon the Republican side of the House to pass it? These actions speak louder than any declamations now can do as to the real effect and meaning of this bill.

It may be asked, however, How is it that the bill is reported at all if it violates any of the principles of Republican protection? One might answer by asking, How is it, if it does not violate these principles, that stalwart protectionists upon the Republican side refuse to support it, and base their refusal upon the ground that it is contrary to the doctrine of protection, and contrary to the pledges of the Republican party, and in strict accord with Democratic profession? The real answer, though, is found in the demand of public sentiment that relief be given to Cuba, a demand founded in so much justice and fairness that the leaders of the

Republican party did not dare to openly refuse it. Those of them who are wise and farsighted enough, read the handwriting on the wall, that if the greed and rapacity of the protected classes in this country are allowed to stand in the way of the just and humane performance by this Government of its duty, involving its good faith to Cuba, the result will be the overthrow of high protection and the downfall of Republicanism.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I can not; my time is limited.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I just wanted to ask the gentleman a question, and that is, How can the 20 per cent preferential rate of reduction on Cuban tariff against the United States extend the trade of the United States in the matter of imports into Cuba when we already control the trade, except upon mere sentimental grounds which must be overcome in the future?

Mr. BRANTLEY. If the gentleman had been present at the opening of my remarks he would have had an answer to his question. The Democratic position is, if you have a high tariff wall between you and another country, every degree you make on that tariff wall means a free trade to that extent. It is 20 per cent freedom on all trade coming into this country from Cuba, and it is 20 per cent freedom on all going from this country into Cuba.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. But the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I have answered it to the best of my ability.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I want to know in what respect a 20 per cent reduction on the high tariff wall the gentleman refers to is going to increase our trade with Cuba?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman for ten minutes more.

Mr. BRANTLEY. Mr. Chairman, the question of my friend from Louisiana I have answered to the best of my ability. I had passed beyond that question and was proceeding to discuss the political aspects of this question, and have undertaken to show that these Republicans who were farsighted enough to read the handwriting on the wall had discovered that they could not afford to allow the greed and rapacity of the protective classes of this country to stand in the way of the performance of its duty by this Government to the island of Cuba.

This idea was conveyed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], in the course of his speech supporting the bill, when he retorted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], who interrupted him, by saying, "You are taking a course that would strike down the industry you are assuming to protect." This is why the Republican leaders have labored so earnestly to procure enough Republican votes to pass this bill. They do not wish the attention of the country called to their humiliating position of being unable to maintain the honor and keep the faith of this Government without the aid of Democratic votes, and all because the protected classes have become so bold as to openly announce that the only interest and the only care of the Republican party shall be to foster, maintain, and fatten them. This bill therefore comes to us, after prolonged delay and discussion in the ranks of the Republican members of the House, not as representing their doctrine, but as an attempt to appease and in part satisfy a public sentiment that can not be trifled with, and it comes with the assurance from Republican leaders to their faithful followers that protection shall be taken care of, notwithstanding the apparent concession made to its enemies by this bill.

That this bill is intended merely as a sop to public sentiment is plainly shown by the long delay in reporting it, by the many caucuses of the Republicans upon it, by the meager concession—meager in amount and meager in the time in which it is to operate—that it makes to Cuba, and by the conditions imposed upon her—conditions that still further affront her sovereignty and call for still further delay before the small concession granted can be made available.

I am persuaded that public sentiment and public justice are not going to be satisfied with this bill, because it goes too far in its demands upon Cuba, and not far enough in its concessions to her, and fails to do the justice and to keep the faith that the people demand of the party in power.

The discussion we are now having reveals a state of affairs in the majority party never before witnessed by me during the five years that I have been here. I have never before witnessed a real division in the ranks of the majority, and little did I expect to see a division come over the matter of protection, a matter so sacred to the Republican heart. This division shows that the leaven of tariff reform is at work, and the friends of this great

reform must draw some courage and hope from this division among their long-time antagonists.

The Republican leaders, through stress of circumstances uncontrollable by them, have made an advance toward the Democratic position—not much of an advance, it is true, only 20 per cent on one road, but nevertheless an advance. Because of this advance shall we abandon our position? What becomes of our vaunted faith and courage in our position if we are to be driven from it in order that Republicans may seize and occupy it? Is it not better for us to hold our ground and herald to the country this concession to the principles we maintain, and to fight for still greater concessions to come? Tariff reform can not be intrusted to its enemies or left in the keeping of those who have made reform a necessity; and every victory that tariff reform wins in the public mind or in this forum must redound to the good of the Democratic party. [Loud applause.]

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill occupies an anomalous position before this committee.

It is not supported sincerely by a majority on either the Republican or Democratic side of this House. It comes before the House reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, the majority of which strongly oppose any other measure of tariff modification.

This bill is also supported by a free-trade Democratic element, which will vote for any modification of any tariff schedule, on the theory that it is one step toward their paradise of free trade. The bill is opposed by two elements of the Republicans; by one, which on principle opposes any changes whatever in our present tariff schedules; by another element which desires modification in our tariff schedules affecting such items as iron and steel, glassware, wood pulp, etc., and resists the passage of this bill, that such modifications may be the earlier made.

This bill is also opposed by some Democrats who favor a limited protection and by others who believe in free trade with no intermediate steps.

ARGUMENTS FOR PASSAGE OF BILL.

It is urged that this bill is an Administration measure, and that it is our duty to pass it for three reasons: First, that we owe an obligation to Cuba, our ward, to start the island upon its career as an independent nation—prosperous and able to properly perform its governmental functions—and that because the present price of sugar, the main crop of Cuba, is so low in the markets of the world that Cuban merchants and planters are threatened with bankruptcy, and hence distress, disaster, and possibly revolution may befall its new government.

Secondly, it is urged because the adoption of the so-called Platt amendment by the Cuban convention implied or promised an obligation on the part of our Government to grant preferential trade privileges.

Third, it is urged that the reciprocity proposed by this bill would be of mutual benefit to Cuba and to the United States.

Thus it will be seen that this bill is proposed by two classes of our people—by those who conceive from a sentimental or charitable view we owe an obligation to Cuba and by those who believe it would be good business policy for our country to enter into the trade relations provided in this bill.

OBLIGATIONS OF CUBA TO THE UNITED STATES.

It is important at the outset to examine the relations between Cuba and the United States and to ascertain the true condition of the island and its people.

It is admitted that the United States made war upon Spain mainly because of Cuba; that for Cuba several thousand of our brave boys yielded their lives; that our people expended more than four hundred millions of our treasure, and will carry on the pension rolls of our nation the names of many thousands of our heroes, who for years in the future will receive millions from our Treasury as a partial compensation for their sacrifices on behalf of Cuba.

From our own funds we paid \$3,000,000 to the insurgent army and at the close of the war donated 6,000,000 of rations to her starving people.

We cleaned her cities from the accumulated filth of centuries, banished the scourge of yellow fever from her ports, and made the pest holes of the West Indies the sites of a flourishing commerce and of a happy, healthy people. We have builded magnificent roads across the island, employing their people, improving their property, and developing their resources.

We have established more than 3,000 schools, where the bright youth of the island can lay the foundation for the future of that country and acquire that learning and experience of American methods and patriotism that will insure some day a splendid prosperity.

We have given their people the benefit and example of one of the most just and efficient civil governments in all history, a model to all the nations, and an example indeed to many of the

municipalities in our own country. Within the Dingley bill was a provision for a discriminating and countervailing duty in our markets against the bounty-fed sugars of Europe, to the extent of such bounty thereby preventing such sugars overwhelming our country, and retaining the best market in the world for the benefit of the Cuban planters. For the past four years the sugar industry in Cuba has been kept alive by this discrimination in their favor, though by it our exports have incurred the hostility of the sugar-producing nations of Europe, and undoubtedly a loss of some millions in our export trade has been caused by this preference to Cuban sugar and this devotion to the Cuban people.

We establish this Cuban government with a revenue system properly administered, and send it forth as an independent government, free from all national indebtedness. No nation on earth ever entered upon its career with so many blessings in its hand granted by the bounty of its generous benefactor.

For all these we have received and asked and been offered no recompense.

If any further obligation from our Government or our people can be conceived, we should know whether it is due to the Cuban people as classes or individuals or to the Cuban government as a separate entity.

OBLIGATIONS TO CUBAN PEOPLE.

Whatever obligations we may be under to Cuba, whatever obligations we are under to its people, it is important for us to consider carefully what these various obligations are, to what people or classes of people we owe a duty, and if we owe a duty, what we should do to adequately fulfill it.

I wish to discuss briefly what classes of the Cuban people have been presented to whom it is claimed an obligation from this Government is due. First, it is necessary always to consider that class which can never help themselves, which is always dependent upon any government for protection, and whose prosperity is always the foundation of real prosperity of the nation, and that is the laboring class of the community. The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, the statements in the press, the observations of those who are acquainted with the conditions of the island of Cuba, all inform us that not only has there been no distress among the laboring classes of Cuba up to this time, but in the future there promises to be no great distress requiring such extreme action as this bill proposes. Work has been more than plentiful during the past year. In public work there is being constructed a railroad nearly 700 miles, the length of the island, and lateral branches to the north and south shores. Much public work in building roads, sewers, and the like is going on at Habana and Santiago.

The crop of sugar for the year has been harvested, or will be by the 1st of May. The crop of next year is practically planted and must be cared for. The same plants which have raised the present crop of Cuban sugar will raise the crop for next year and must be cared for on the large plantations. Any plantings this year will produce a crop for seven and in many cases ten years following, and the large plantations will not be allowed to run to waste when work now will produce a profit for more than two-thirds of that period. During the past year there has been a deficiency of labor. At one part of the island along the railroad line the contractors were obliged to discharge their men, over 3,000 in number, in order that these men might be utilized in securing and harvesting the crop of sugar. That condition will continue during the next year, so there is no real danger of any distress among the laboring classes of the island, and they do not need the relief afforded by this or any other bill. What they need is what all classes always need—a good, just, wise, and strong administration that shall inspire confidence in the development of the magnificent resources of that lovely island.

OBLIGATIONS TO PLANTERS.

It is next important to consider the class which has principally clamored for relief, and that is the large planters of the island. Many of this class have appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means, and their testimony appears in the printed hearings. Their statements have been published in the public press, and that testimony shows that nearly all of them are not residents in Cuba. They are not citizens of that little nation and do not expect to be. They live on the continent of Europe, in Paris, in Madrid, in London, and some of them live in this country and have their splendid homes and offices in New York or in Boston.

This one thing is evident. Those men have no particular love for Cuba; they are looking after their own business. They come here to protect that business. They care nothing in general about the public conditions in Cuba. It is this class of men who ask relief from Congress. They have gone to Cuba from foreign nations, have invested thousands and hundreds of thousands in a business speculation, and when there seems a prospect of a temporary loss of profits they ask a guaranty of their investments from this Congress.

These men took no part in the revolution that is to make Cuba independent. They took no great part in the proceedings that will establish the independent government of Cuba. They will take no particular part in the conduct of its affairs. Yet they have the effrontery to come to this Congress and ask that we change our fiscal policy in order to help their business. They have gone into that business just the same as every man in this country has gone into his business. Many of them have made money in the island of Cuba in the past; they will make money in the future. But because there happens to be a temporary loss in their revenues—because this year by reason of conditions beyond the control of Congress, beyond the control of this country, there is a depression and possible loss in their business—they ask us to make good that deficiency.

WORLD'S SUGAR PRODUCTION.

There is a large surplus of sugar in the world's markets to-day, far more than can be soon consumed.

The world can use about 10,000,000 tons of sugar each year. The best estimate of the world's production for the current year 1902 is taken from the recent Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance for January, 1902, page 2759, as follows:

United States:	Tons.
Louisiana	290,000
Porto Rico	100,000
Hawaiian Islands	800,000
Cuba, crop	875,000
British West Indies:	
Trinidad, exports	50,000
Barbados, exports	60,000
Jamaica	30,000
Antigua and St. Kitts	25,000
French West Indies:	
Martinique, exports	32,000
Guadeloupe	35,000
Danish West Indies:	
St. Croix	13,000
Haiti and Santo Domingo	45,000
Lesser Antilles, not named above	8,000
Mexico, crop	95,000
Central America:	
Guatemala, crop	9,000
San Salvador, crop	5,000
Nicaragua, crop	3,500
Costa Rica, crop	1,500
South America:	
British Guiana (Demerara), exports	95,000
Dutch Guiana (Surinam), crop	6,000
Venezuela	3,000
Peru, exports	105,000
Argentina, crop	115,000
Brazil, crop	215,000
Total in America	2,516,000
Asia:	
British India, exports	15,000
Siam, crop	7,000
Java, crop	765,000
Japan (consumption 170,000 tons, mostly imported)	
Philippine Islands, exports	70,000
China (consumption large, mostly imported)	
Total in Asia	857,000
Australia and Polynesia:	
Queensland	117,000
New South Wales	19,000
Fiji Islands, exports	33,000
Total in Australia and Polynesia	169,000
Africa:	
Egypt, crop	95,000
Mauritius	145,000
Reunion	35,000
Total in Africa	275,000
Europe—Spain	33,000
Total cane-sugar production (W. & G.)	3,850,000
Europe beet-sugar production (Licht)	6,710,000
United States beet-sugar production (W. & G.)	150,000
Grand total cane and beet sugar	10,710,000

It is also estimated that at least half a million tons of old sugar had accumulated in the world's markets, and it is noticeable that the above table includes none of the beet-sugar crop of 1901 of the United States, estimated by the Agricultural Department at 182,000 long tons. It will be seen that there is at this time a surplus of a million to a million and a half tons in the world. This of necessity reduces prices of sugar in all markets. Cuba produced at least her share of this increase and surplus. This increase amounted last year to fully 200,000 tons over the previous year. Under ordinary circumstances and conditions Cuba and the sugar raisers of Cuba would be obliged to stand the low prices caused by this surplus. I fail to see any obligation on the part of this Government to increase sugar prices to these speculators who have helped in causing the depression.

Mr. Chairman, I can not consent to vote for any bill that helps that class of people. I do not believe that the Government of the

United States is under any obligation to help that class of our citizens or foreigners who invest their money in a foreign land to compete with our own citizens who pay our taxes and bear the burdens of our country.

OBLIGATION TO CUBAN MERCHANTS.

But there is another class that the report of the Committee on Ways and Means represents as needing relief—the merchants of the island of Cuba. The report goes on to state that business in Cuba is stagnating; that one class of merchants can not pay its indebtedness to another class; that there is a general condition of depression on the island. Who are these merchants who are coming to this Congress asking for relief? Under what obligation are we to them? A large majority of the merchants doing business upon the island of Cuba are Spaniards—men who were born in Spain, men who have never renounced their allegiance to Spain, men who are not citizens of the island of Cuba and do not intend to become such. These native Spaniards, these Spanish citizens, control the sugar trade of Cuba, and they intend to do so. They are the men who come before this Congress and ask for relief. They opposed the revolution; they have opposed the establishment of an independent government for Cuba, and they will not help that government after it is established.

Now, let us consider the condition of distress in which those people are stated to be. Remember that these men have almost a monopoly of the sugar business. They have driven out the native Cubans. They have driven out the English and the Germans and the French. They have driven out the American merchants, and they have even driven out the Hebrew merchants. Go through the island of Cuba to-day and you see no Hebrew merchants. The Spaniards have driven them out, and those are the same Spaniards who are coming here and asking relief of Congress. Let us see how much they need it.

One year ago it was my privilege, together with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WARNER], to visit that island. We went over that island from east to west and from north to south. While we were in the city of Cienfuegos we went into the largest bank of the city in order to transact some necessary financial business. While there we inquired about the condition of the merchants and the planters in that vicinity.

Now, the city of Cienfuegos is the largest city in the southern part of the island. It is the center of the sugar district of southern Cuba, where Mr. Atkins, of Boston, and Mr. Terry, the great planter, do their business. At that point cluster a large number of rich and splendid plantations of these sugar barons. We asked the condition of the merchants and planters of that city. The banker took out a statement of the bank deposits on that day in that city; and it showed that in Cienfuegos on the first day of April a year ago there was on deposit in the banks of that city over \$12,000,000 Spanish gold. Twelve millions Spanish gold on deposit in the banks of one city of 59,000 people by the census of the year before!

COMPARE BANK DEPOSITS WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. Chairman, that is a larger amount per capita than can be found in any city of the United States. I have here a list sent to me last week by the Comptroller of the Currency showing the national-bank deposits of some of the cities of the United States.

Deposits of national banks, as shown by reports of condition February 25, 1902.

Cities.	Population.	Deposits.
Washington, D. C.	280,000	\$19,299,966.05
Memphis	102,320	6,891,612.22
Nashville	80,865	5,317,341.84
Seattle	80,671	11,196,686.21
Richmond	85,050	7,090,053.48
St. Paul	163,065	16,241,090.59
Duluth	52,969	4,059,599.78
Rochester	162,608	5,609,037.10
Syracuse	108,374	7,096,093.05
Louisville	204,701	12,124,429.06
Omaha	102,505	13,452,738.85
Charleston, S. C.	55,807	3,344,201.53

Now, let us compare that city of 59,000 people that is said to be in a condition of distress, but has bank deposits amounting to \$12,000,000. Let us make a comparison with the condition of affairs at some of the banks in the United States. The city of St. Paul, with a population of 163,000—nearly three times as large—has deposits of \$16,000,000—but a fourth more. The city of Washington, with 280,000,000 population, has bank deposits amounting to about \$19,000,000; the city of Memphis, with 102,000 inhabitants, has about \$6,800,000 deposits; the city of Louisville, with a population of 204,000, has bank deposits amounting to \$12,124,000; the city of Seattle, with 80,000 population, has bank deposits amounting to \$11,150,000; the city of Richmond, with 85,000 inhabitants, has bank deposits amounting to \$7,000,000. And so I might go on. You will find that no single city in the

United States had on the date in question the amount of deposits per capita that the city of Cienfuegos had.

I tried to verify my figures. I called at the insular bureau of the War Department and asked the accommodating chief, Colonel Edwards, for all information on file. He said he had nothing in his office upon that subject, but he had no doubt that they were correct from his general information upon that point, and that there was a larger sum per capita on deposit in Habana than there was in Cienfuegos, and probably as much, at least, in Matanzas as there was in Cienfuegos.

NO PANICS IN CUBA.

In addition to that is another significant fact stated by Mr. Charles M. Pepper in his letter from Cuba, published in the Washington Star of April 12, 1902, that notwithstanding all the ravages and losses of the war no financial panic had occurred upon the island of Cuba.

The large banking institutions, public and private, the large mercantile institutions had weathered the stress and storm of a terrible revolution and yet now we are asked to relieve them when the price of sugar falls, as the chairman of the committee [Mr. PAYNE] states, to 1.81 cents per pound.

The same issue of Monthly Summary, January, 1902, page 2736, shows that at Matanzas, December, 1899, the price of sugar was as low as 1.76 cents per pound and yet no cry of distress was raised, and they did not even claim they were losing money and demanded no help from the United States.

Now, gentlemen, that was the condition of the merchants and the rich planters of the island. That is the condition of the Spanish merchants, who have a monopoly of the sugar business in that island. They have more money on deposit to-day than has the average merchant class of the United States, and yet they have the effrontery to come before this Congress and ask that we should pass this bill for their relief.

OBLIGATION TO SMALL PLANTERS.

But there is yet another class for whose necessities we are asked to pass this bill, and that is the class of the small planters of the island that were spoken of so eloquently by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in his opening address. Now, let us examine the condition of that class, for if any people in the island of Cuba do need relief it is the small planter. The facts before the committee show and a report of the census of Cuba shows that the small planter is heavily mortgaged; that in the provinces of Matanzas and Santa Clara, where the greater part of the sugar is raised, those small plantations are mortgaged for 80 per cent of their value. That is true. It is true, also, that those mortgages are overdue, that foreclosure of them has been stayed by the military power, and that stay will necessarily expire in May next, when the military authority of the United States will go out of operation.

Now, remember those mortgages are due in May. It is undoubtedly true that their crops are either mortgaged or sold and that those crops are practically harvested now. Now, conceding all of those things to be true, how does this bill afford them any relief? Conceding that they ought to have relief, conceding that they need relief, let us see how this bill relieves them. The gentleman from New York stated that there were between 15,000 and 16,000 of them. The census of the island of Cuba shows that there were 13,517 of them. Another report I have, which I obtained from the Insular Department, shows there were about 14,414 of them; so it is perfectly safe to state that there were about 15,000 of these small planters in the island of Cuba. The gentleman from New York also stated that by reason of the passage of this bill there would be a reduction in our revenues of sugar of about \$6,000,000; in other words, that we would try to help the sugar planters of the island of Cuba by this reduction of about \$6,000,000. How much of this will go to the sugar trust I confess I do not know.

I have read the testimony of Colonel Bliss, the collector of customs at Habana, one of the fairest of witnesses, who stated that about 30 per cent would go to the planters and the rest of those who raise sugar on the island. Upon this basis only \$1,800,000 annually would be received by the large and small planters. Perhaps as fair a statement as I have seen was made by Mr. Pepper, the correspondent of a syndicate of American newspapers, who advocates the passage of this bill. Mr. Pepper has a large experience in Cuba. He has traversed that island several times and perhaps is as accurate and as careful as anybody in his knowledge of its affairs. In a letter to the Washington Star, another paper which strongly advocates the passage of this bill, published on the 15th day of March last, Mr. Pepper went into this question somewhat and made the statement, giving it his approval, that a small planter there thought that about one-half of our concession would go to the sugar trust and about one-half of it to the planter. That seems a fair estimate. One-half, then, of \$6,000,000, or \$3,000,000, would be received by the planters.

Now, the census figures show that two-thirds of the land producing sugar is owned by large planters, not included in this class of 15,000, so that two-thirds, or \$2,000,000, of this reduction would go to these nonresident large planters, or leaving about \$1,000,000 for the relief of these 15,000 small planters. One million dollars divided among 15,000 makes an average of \$66 apiece, and that is the relief proposed by this bill. Sixty-six dollars on an average to pay off their mortgages, to pay for the hypothecation of their crops, to save themselves, their families, and their farms for next year. If Colonel Bliss's estimate be correct, only one-third of \$1,800,000, or \$600,000, would be received by the small planters, or an average of \$40 each. But when does this \$66 or this \$40 come?

CONDITIONS OF RELIEF.

It comes, as the bill goes on to provide, after they have passed our immigration and labor restriction, Chinese-exclusion, and that kind of laws. Now, remember the Cuban government goes into effect on the 20th day of May. They must get their congress together, they must form their committees, they must appoint a committee that can examine our laws (printed in a foreign language), consider the effect of those foreign laws, and then frame as best they can a system of laws adapted to their country that shall be similar or substantially the same as our immigration, contract-labor, and Chinese-exclusion laws. After they have passed those laws they must certify those laws to this country.

The President must again examine them and find they are substantially the same as ours, and then as one condition he can issue his proclamation, so they can begin to realize this \$40 or \$66. Now, how long will that take? Everyone knows it must require at least six months to do all of that business. But another thing that they must do. They must give us at least 20 per cent reduction of their tariff upon our goods going into Cuba. Remember that government must get into operation; it must have its congress, which must appoint its committee, and a committee must completely revise its tariff. Because they are on a revenue basis, they need all of their revenues and more to carry on their business. They have no margin of tariff to concede for reciprocity with any country. Now, it is a rather important thing to revise the tariff, as the gentleman from New York and his associates claim. They strongly denounce any attempt to revise the tariff of this country on the ground that it will greatly disturb the business interests of the country. Yet as one of the main conditions of this relief the Cubans must revise their tariff at the beginning of a government and at a time of such business distress that requires the passage of this act.

It is stated a period of business stagnation exists; yet you compel those men to revise their tariff, raise the tariff on things coming from other countries than ours, and either leave ours stationary or lower the tariff on articles coming from this country. After that is done it must be certified to this country. The President must examine it to see there is at least a 20 per cent reduction, and that also will take six months. So that it is thoroughly safe to say, from the conditions surrounding this matter, that it will require at least six months to get it into full operation. At the end of six months these poor planters whose property is mortgaged, whose crops are mortgaged, who are suffering and distressed, can get from \$40 to \$66, if they can last that long.

LIQUIDATION NECESSARY.

In our own country these conditions would require liquidation of this indebtedness and the getting into the region of new people and additional capital. Some suffering and distress always attends, but it may be necessary for the future of the island, for the future prosperity of the people, that some liquidation be had there and new owners, new blood, new ideas, and new methods and capital flow into the waste places and make them "to blossom as the rose."

Gentlemen, I do not believe the American people, if they understood that proposition, would advocate that petty kind of relief. I certainly can not vote for it.

RELIEF IN THIS COUNTRY.

But we in the West and South have had some experience with our people who have needed relief. We have had small farmers in our section of the country who have needed assistance. We have had people who have come from abroad, have declared their intention to make their homes with us. Men, too, from our own land—born here—have gone into the frontier and taken their families. They have builded their huts of sod or of logs as best they could. They have done their best to make a crop. They have seen the pitiless sun or the equally pitiless flood wipe that crop off the face of the earth. They have seen their families starving and suffering the horrible privations of inclement winter, their little property mortgaged and taken sometimes by pitiless creditors. They have asked for relief in their desperation; but up to this time I have not heard one of those cries heeded by the American Congress. And I believe that it would be a sad precedent for us to give relief even to those who need it as sorely as

many have in the West and South. I believe those matters should be relegated to the States, and I believe the matter of relieving these Cuban planters should be relegated to Cuba itself. They are able to take care of it. We will establish them as an independent government, free from all indebtedness. They have a rich island, one of the most productive and resourceful under the sun.

They can borrow money if necessary; or, if we need to help them, let us help the government of Cuba and let that government do as it ought—help its own people. Our States have done that in the past, and the Cuban state can do it in Cuba. If they need seed, let the government of Cuba give it to them. If they need roads to employ their labor, to keep them from starvation, as we have done in the North, let the government of Cuba build those roads. Let them dig harbors and sewers and streets; let them build their buildings; let them give their people information and encouragement and whatever assistance may be needed in the diversification of their crops. Let them do these things and they will find and develop a happy and a prosperous people. But if you adopt this method of encouraging the raising of one crop you will continue the condition there that has been a curse in every part of this country. A one-crop region is an accursed region. It has blasted our Northwest when we raised wheat alone. It has blasted the Southwest when they raised corn alone. It has blasted the South when they raised cotton alone. It will blast Cuba if she raises sugar alone. And yet this bill tends to perpetuate that accursed condition on the island of Cuba when it practically gives a bounty for the raising of sugar.

NO OBLIGATION TO INDIVIDUALS.

I do not believe that the Government of the United States should assist or that this bill will help any needy individual or class of individuals.

If we are under obligation to do anything it is not to help a class, but the whole; not to help individuals, but the mass of the people or the nation itself. If we are under any obligations beyond the multitude of our good works already performed, it is to establish a government that shall render equally good service to the governed. This bill can not accomplish that result.

If to prevent starvation and bankruptcy it be necessary for the Cuban Government to help its planters and laboring men, by work and seed and loans and roads and the like; if we are really under obligation to render some assistance, let us help to accomplish these really beneficial things.

The Cuban Government will start with a treasury nearly empty. If we must help, let our Government, from its overflowing resources, purchase rights to naval and coaling stations, to the Isle of Pines, and to preferential trade, if necessary, and pay for these a good round sum—millions of dollars—that shall really help the Cuban Government, and through it may reach the deserving Cuban people.

Such payment could not be absorbed by the sugar trust, could not be reached by the rich nonresidents and foreigners. It would establish a weak government at the critical time of its history and could be applied to help that people which really needs relief. If any obligation from us is really due, that is the way to fulfill it.

NO IMMEDIATE ANNEXATION.

Now, there has been a reason advanced by nearly every one of the advocates of this bill—that if we did not pass it Cuba would speedily seek annexation to the United States. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] hung up this "bogey man" to scare the members of this House into voting for this bill. Now, gentlemen, I really can not consent to be scared in that way. I do not believe there is any danger of immediate annexation of the island of Cuba to the United States. I do not believe that Cuba wants it or would allow immediate annexation. The reasons for that to me seem conclusive. There are practically three classes of people to consider in ascertaining whether or not Cuba wants annexation. The first class would be similar to those who have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, the class of large planters, the class of Spanish merchants, the class of the professional men who reside in the cities and towns.

Undoubtedly many of them favor and would profit by annexation. That class opposed the revolution. That class did nothing to free Cuba from the dominion of Spain. That class have done comparatively little to establish the Cuban government. That class is doing little now to carry on affairs in Cuba. They are a selfish class of people. They have looked after their own interests closely. They have tried during the past few years to carry water on both shoulders. They have favored Spain when they were with the Spanish; they have favored the revolution when they were with the Cubans; they have favored "Cuba libre" when they were with the native Cubans during the last few years. They have come to us while we have been in possession and have told us "For God's sake do not desert the island." They dare not stand upright for annexation. They have never dared to defend the good name on interests of the United States, even

when we were helping them. They have never dared to stand for anything in the island of Cuba.

That is the first class—the class which really desires annexation.

NATIVES OPPOSE ANNEXATION.

Now, the second class composes the great bulk of the population of Cuba, the native Cubans, the laboring classes, the classes who work in the factories and on the farms and in the cities and villages. Now, remember that more than two-thirds of the whole people and the principal part of that class can not read and write. They are an ignorant, narrow people. They know nothing outside of their own little immediate vicinity. They know nothing of the great power and advantages of a union with the United States. They know nothing practically of affairs in their own island. There has been one idea dominating those people for the past generation, and that is free and independent Cuba. Cuba libre has been the cry of the native Cubans. They have seen their brothers and their fathers suffer and die on account of Cuba libre. They have seen them and their families starve in the camps of reconcentration, and those cries and struggles, those sufferings have impressed one thing above all others upon the native Cuban, and that is that he wants an independent, free government for Cuba.

This is not a bad or a vicious people. They are not hard to govern within their limits and prejudices. But their ways are not our ways. They are prejudiced against the United States. They do not like us or our methods. They do not want us or our government, and we might expect an awful conflict to enforce any of our authority.

All the American planters, and all the witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee, and all the machinations of the military government can not change the determination of the native Cubans to have Cuba libre. I do not want them to change it. I want them to have it, and to do all that they can to make it prosperous. Now, that is the second class to be considered.

POLITICIANS OPPOSE ANNEXATION.

The third class are the native Cuban politicians, the men who were interested in the active Cuban current affairs. The men who agitated the beginning of the revolution with Spain, who carried on that revolution, who dominated the Cuban convention, and who to-day will dominate the Cuban government. They are the men who are directly interested in free Cuba. They want the offices of the island; they want her a free and independent nation; they want to have the power, the offices, and the glory, and some of them undoubtedly want plunder.

Now, these are the men who have control of and will control Cuban sentiment. They know how to control that second class, the great native population of the island. They know how to stimulate that sentiment for a free and independent Cuba. They have prejudiced them against our Government and people. You go among the Cuban people to-day the native Cubans, and among the Cuban politicians and laborers, and you will find that they are prejudiced and hostile toward us. Gentlemen, you can pass your bill or fail to pass it, but it will make no difference in the sentiment of those people so far as annexation is concerned. The great bulk of the population of that island know nothing about it and will know nothing about it.

I noticed with some interest an article in the current North American Review for April by the Right Hon. James Bryce, a member of the British Parliament, the author of *The American Commonwealth*. He treated this question at some length. I commend it to the attention of the gentleman from New York, and after its careful perusal I think he can well afford to lay aside his boggy man. Some day the destiny of Cuba will be linked with that of the United States. But that day is not near and will not be affected by this measure.

PLATT AMENDMENT.

It is urged, as a second reason for the passage of this bill, that because the Cuban convention adopted the so-called Platt amendment, defining the relations between Cuba and the United States, that thereby was promised or implied some obligation on the part of Cuba to receive trade preferences from Congress.

It would seem almost unnecessary to consider such a proposition were it not seriously urged by honest, patriotic men.

The Constitution of the United States clearly defines where lies the power to make promises and incur obligations relative to trade and finance. The history of this country for more than a century has settled that point. Congress is the only authority which can incur such obligations or can make such promises, and no one pretends that Congress has ever acted. If we now allow the naked promise or assurance of any official, however patriotic his motives or lofty his purpose or his station, to be regarded as an obligation compelling legislation by Congress upon our fiscal or governmental policies a sad precedent will be established, liable to lead to a multitude of evils.

The country realizes there is too much power in the great Executive Departments now. We must not allow more by conceding power to make promises affecting legislation upon our revenues. The Platt amendment benefited Cuba even more than it did the United States.

Without any expense to Cuba it protects her independence as a nation—the life, property, and security of her people, the health of her communities, and her future from the reckless extravagance and waste of corrupt rulers, as well as from the clutches of remorseless creditors. There should be and will be unspeakable gratitude flow to us for this beneficence instead of obligations for our action in securing the adoption of this ordinance by the Cuban convention.

ABILITY TO MAKE TREATIES.

It is seriously urged that this Platt amendment destroyed the power and ability of Cuba to make commercial treaties with other nations, and that when Cuba became separated from Spain she lost the markets of her mother land. These arguments have no basis in fact, conditions, or history. Spain never purchased Cuban sugar and never would. For the ten years previous to the war less than 2 per cent of Cuban sugar went to Spain, and for some years past Spain has produced a surplus of sugar for sale in the markets of the world. Last year her surplus was 33,000 tons. There is no nation in the world which would make any advantageous trade alliance with Cuba so that Cuban sugar could have entered its markets.

Every important nation in the world, except Great Britain and the United States, is a producer and an exporter of sugar, and no nation except the United States has ever entertained a notion that it would be good policy to admit Cuban sugar to compete and possibly crush her own domestic sugar industry, so that no trade agreements are possible to help the sugar interests. Great Britain will not make preferential trade agreements with any nation; she does not even favor the cane sugar produced by her own colonies. The English market is monopolized by the bounty-fed German beet sugar to the exclusion of West Indian cane sugar. There are to-day 35 refineries for beet sugar, and only 1 for cane sugar in the British Islands.

COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.

The result is that the only market in the world for Cuban sugar is or can be the United States. We have maintained that market for the benefit of the Cubans by a provision in the Dingley bill for countervailing duties on continental sugars which receive export bounties. This has not only preserved the sugar industry of Cuba, but has increased it from 212,000 tons in 1897, to about 900,000 tons in 1902.

Not one note of gratitude has yet been heard for this invaluable assistance by the American people. Instead there is a demand for further concessions that threaten to ruin our own domestic sugar production and embroil us in commercial warfare with some of our best European customers, who wish entrance to our markets for some of their vast surplus of sugar. The European nations which export sugar annually purchase more than \$300,000,000 of our products, mostly agricultural and produced by the farmers of the West. This immense export trade is threatened by restriction or extinction, if we allow our market to be monopolized by Cuban sugar, by reason of trade agreements in which they are not equally favored.

I do not believe any obligation exists or has ever been conceived which requires our people or our Government to undertake a course of action toward Cuba which may result in such distress and disaster to our own people. I am opposed to that sort of obligation and that sort of legislation.

One point more, Mr. Chairman, on the question of reciprocity. Now, I am a Republican. I believe in reciprocity. I believe in the protective system, so that reciprocity may be possible. If you were to create genuine reciprocity in this bill I would favor it. It is necessary to consider in connection with the question of reciprocity how far the cost to us will equal the aid we get. If this question be considered alone on the plane of sentiment, if it be considered alone on our duty and obligation to Cuba, so be it. From such a basis I do not believe this measure meets any expectation, fulfills any obligation, or helps the Cuban to attain his destiny. But from the other standpoint of reciprocity for the benefit to and fro, I do not believe it justifiable. It is urged on behalf of this bill that we will get large benefits and extension of our trade. Let us consider that, not from a sentimental standpoint, but from a practical standpoint. Remember, this bill lasts only for a year and a half, until December, 1903. It is important, first, that we consider under its operations how much extension of trade Cuba would probably have in the aggregate with all the countries of the earth.

TRADE OF CUBA.

Now, the most prosperous era in the island of Cuba was during the McKinley reciprocity period in 1894. In that year they sold

us more than \$78,000,000 of their products. They sold different countries of the world over \$100,000,000 of their products. One would think that if there was any period in their history when they would purchase a large amount of goods from the markets of the world that would have been the time. During that time in that year, when there were more than \$100,000,000 worth of exports to the markets of the world, they purchased and imported \$68,713,280. Now, in 1900—I just want to make a comparison so that we can see how much may be done—Cuba purchased \$66,700,000 worth, and in the same year sold \$48,904,648 of her goods. It does not make any large difference whether they sell \$100,000,000 worth of goods or \$50,000,000 worth in any particular year, the trade of Cuba will not be greatly increased. There is another reason why it can not be greatly increased under the provisions of this bill. It is stated by gentlemen who favor this bill that all labor is employed upon the island. There can be no increase in the sugar crop without more labor, and this bill by its terms prohibits the introduction of more labor. Without having additional labor, by prohibiting that labor, there can be no increase in their sugar crop, and without an increase in the sugar crop there is no hope of enlarging their purchases from the markets of the world.

It is true there was an increase in our export trade to Cuba from about \$11,000,000 in 1891 to about \$24,000,000 in 1894 under the McKinley reciprocity act. But it is equally true that with no reciprocity our exports to Cuba in 1900 were over \$39,176,002, and in 1901 were over \$28,078,633, an increase in each of these years of over \$4,000,000 above our greatest exports during the most splendid era of reciprocity.

LIST OF EXPORTS.

I have carefully examined the list of exports in 1894 and in 1901, to ascertain what articles were sold in larger amounts in 1894 than were sold in 1901. This examination discloses that the following list covers practically all of the articles in which there was a decrease in 1901, viz, breadstuffs, including all grains and flour; fruit, hay, provisions, including beef and dairy products, tallow and hog products, such as hams and lard; potatoes, machinery, railway bars and cars, engines, saws, and tools, wire, nails, and harness. In every other line there was an increase of sales in 1901 over 1894. An examination of the above list of articles purchased by Cuba in the years 1900 and 1901 further discloses that in all of them the United States has practically a monopoly of the Cuban market.

Appended is a statement showing the approximate percentage of such goods obtained by Cuba from the United States during the last two years:

	Per cent.
Mules—We furnish of her mules over.....	75
From United States:	
Hogs.....	95
Corn.....	99
Bran and fodder.....	89
Oats.....	98
Brick.....	90
Cars (railway and street).....	99½
Coal.....	99
Hay.....	90
From United States—Continued.	Per cent.
Instruments (scientific).....	90
Steel and steel rails.....	88
Structural iron and steel.....	99½
Agricultural and electrical machinery.....	98
Sewing machines.....	90
Steam engines, locomotives, stationary engines, and boilers.....	62
Sugar machinery.....	93
All other machinery.....	88

Flour, all from the United States.
 Builders' hardware, 52 per cent from the United States.
 Tools and implements, 61 per cent from the United States.
 Tin, United States and Great Britain about divide the trade.
 Paints, nearly 50 per cent from the United States.
 Paper and manufactures of, the United States, Germany, France, and Spain divide the trade.
 Malt liquors, about 71 per cent from the United States.
 Meats (salt and pickled), 50 per cent from the United States.
 (a) Beef, canned, all from United States; fresh, all from United States.
 Beef, salt or pickled, all from the United States.
 (b) Beef, jerked or tajaso, nearly all of Uruguay.
 I will explain this further on.
 Bacon, nearly all from United States.
 Hams and shoulders, nearly all from United States.
 Pork, salt or pickled, nearly all from United States.
 Lard, nearly all from United States.
 Oleomargarine, nearly all from United States.
 Condensed milk, nearly all from United States.
 Butter, United States, Denmark, and Spain divide the trade.
 Cheese, mostly from the Netherlands. (Matter of taste, probably.)
 Rice, from Great Britain and Germany, \$3,100,000. (I will refer to rice again.)
 Beans and peas, 60 per cent from United States.
 Potatoes, 55 per cent from United States.
 Wood (a) boards, shingles, shooks, logs, lumber, and timber, nearly all from United States.
 (b) Furniture, nearly all from United States.
 (c) Hogsheads, all from United States and Spain.

Meats, Mr. Place (p. 92) wanted the committee to assume that Cuba with reciprocity or liberal reduction of duty would take American beef instead of jerked beef. There is really no chance for any such result.

(See Commerce of Cuba, Insular Affairs, War Department, November, 1900, p. 304.)

The report cited shows that Uruguay and Argentina (if not Cuba itself eventually) will furnish the beef for the island. There is a 66 per cent advantage in favor of South American meat, to say nothing of climatic conditions, which make more favorable the safe handling of beef products from South America.

It will be seen that the only reason there is a decrease in the amounts of these articles sold is because the Cuban people do not use more goods. When they use more we will sell more, and it must also be recalled that the prices per unit for all of these articles is very much less in 1901 than it was in 1894. The price of flour per barrel averaged a dollar and 1 cent less in the later year than in the earlier. The aggregate amount exported of bushels of corn or oats or pounds of provisions have actually increased from the earlier to a later year.

POSSIBLE GAIN IN EXPORTS.

The only articles then in which there is possible a gain of trade under any reciprocal treaty would be those shown by the report of Cuban imports that were not purchased in the United States and in which we can fairly compete. The statement of Colonel Bliss, collector of customs, on page 581 of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on the present bill, was that over \$34,962,000 of Cuban importation were from other countries than the United States.

Careful examination shows that about \$18,000,000 of these articles either can not be produced in the United States or can not be produced profitably for the Cuban market. Most of these articles, when used in the United States, are imported by this country, such as wines and liquors, silks, some fine varieties of textiles, crockery, books, and art goods, fruits, and various kind of cattle that can not be produced economically here. There remain then about \$16,000,000 in which we may compete with other countries in the Cuban markets. A careful examination of the last report of the Insular Bureau upon Cuban imports shows that there were 37 articles imported into Cuba during the eight months ending August, 1901, of which more than \$100,000 were purchased in other countries than the United States. In these articles it is possible to obtain additional trade by reason of discrimination of preferences in the Cuban tariff.

The aggregate imports of these are about \$16,000,000 from all countries. The present Cuban tariff was constructed by our own officers and naturally inclines slightly in our favor. It is not possible under the provisions of this bill for us to hope to obtain more than one-half of this additional trade.

PREJUDICED AGAINST OUR GOODS.

The people using these articles are prejudiced against this country and against its products. The importers who handle these goods and direct the tastes and habits of the people are mostly Spanish, who prefer to encourage French and Spanish manufacturers and who prefer to deal with those with whom they have dealt for many years past. It will require a long time for these merchants and these people to become accustomed to our goods. It will require a long time for our merchants and our manufacturers to adapt themselves and their trade in these competing articles to the Cuban taste and to the Cuban market. It will require large expenditures on their part to solicit this trade, introduce their goods, and change their machinery and methods to meet the Cuban requirements.

CUBAN PREJUDICES.

On two occasions in Cuba I personally noticed the native prejudice against American goods.

At Santiago I met a Philadelphia traveling man for a linen house of that city, and went with him to the various merchants of Santiago. Not one of these merchants would consider any trade with the United States. They would not examine the goods, though the prices were as low and the traveling man claimed the quality and terms as good as would be furnished by European competitors.

A few days later, at Cienfuegos, I met a Boston traveling man for a boot and shoe house. He had a similar experience; only one merchant in Cienfuegos would examine his goods, although we stated, what is everywhere known, that American shoes have the best quality and style of any in the world. The prices were low, but the native taste preferred the cheap Spanish product.

This bill only proposes a preferential tariff for about eighteen months, until December, 1903. Clearly not a sufficient time for either the Spanish merchants or the Cuban people to become accustomed to American goods or for American merchants and manufacturers to adapt themselves to the tastes and wants of the Spanish merchant or the Cuban people. Some few goods will be sold to which the Cuban people are accustomed, but there can be no reasonable hope of securing the monopoly of this trade of \$16,000,000 annually in which other nations have a chance for competition. A careful scrutiny of these different articles and the conditions of their sale in Cuba discloses that if there be a

gain of our trade of \$8,000,000 annually by reason of the passage of this bill, it is all that can be reasonably expected.

COST OF INCREASED TRADE.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] stated the reduction of our revenue by reason of the passage of this bill would be about \$8,000,000 annually. It would pay, then, for our Government to purchase every dollar's worth of the additional goods which would be sold from our own country to Cuba by reason of the passage of this measure, send them to Cuba and donate them to its people. This is not the reciprocity of Blaine and McKinley, and it is not the reciprocity proposed by Republican platforms and policies, yet this is the kind of reciprocity and reciprocal gain in our trade that is proposed by this measure.

COLLATERAL EFFECTS.

Its collateral effects upon both Cuba and the United States in their dealings with other nations should not be underestimated. Cuba sells the bulk of her cheap manufactured tobaccos to the extent of from \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 annually to other countries than the United States.

There is no market for such goods here, and we do not want them here to interfere with our own manufacturers of cigars. But if Cuba discriminates against the products of Germany, Spain, France, and England, who use these tobaccos, she must expect in return that retaliation will be made and her tobacco trade be greatly injured. And the United States must expect that if it discriminates in favor of Cuban sugar, so that German, French, Dutch, and Austrian sugar be excluded from our markets, that retaliation will be made against our products, and that our annual trade of more than \$300,000,000 with these nations will be greatly impaired.

IT IS UNWISE LEGISLATION.

From every standpoint this proposed legislation is unwise and unpatriotic. It does not help the Cubans who need assistance, it does not help the Cuban government to assist or protect its people or to carry into effect its agreements with our Government, and it does not help our trade materially with Cuba, but instead may seriously injure our present trade relations with some of our best customers.

But the bill under consideration necessarily helps somebody and some interests, and if it helps one interest it must necessarily hurt some competing interest.

AMERICAN SUGAR MARKET.

The American sugar market is the greatest in the world. Our people consume about 68 pounds of sugar annually per capita. Last year we used 2,300,000 tons, and next year it is estimated that the people will consume about 2,500,000 tons, and in but few years the total consumption will exceed 3,000,000 tons annually. The United States annually pays for sugar imported more than \$100,000,000 more than for any one article of importation. There was produced in this country the past year the following tonnage of sugar:

	Tons.
Southern States, cane sugar, about.....	300,000
Hawaii, cane sugar, about.....	300,000
Porto Rico, cane sugar, about.....	100,000
Northern and Western States beet sugar.....	182,000
Total.....	882,000

or some over one-third of the total consumption of the United States.

The cane sugar is purchased from the Tropics raw, is brought into the immense refineries principally controlled by the American sugar trust known as the American Sugar Refining Company, and from these refineries is distributed all over the country. The only competition with the sugar trust are the cane factories of Louisiana and Texas and the beet-sugar factories of the United States. There are forty-one of the latter scattered from New York to California. These beet-sugar factories all manufacture refined sugar and sell directly to the trade. None of the American beet sugar passes through the refineries of the sugar trust. This is the competition which the American sugar trust desires to strangle; this is the enemy which it mostly fears.

BEET-SUGAR POSSIBILITIES.

The reports of our consuls in Germany and France and the testimony of the Cuban planters all concur that at this time beet sugar refined is produced in Germany as cheaply as cane sugar can be produced in Cuba and refined or distributed in the United States. And it is conceded that refined beet sugar can and will be produced at from 2 to 2½ cents per pound under favorable conditions. These great results can be attained in Germany, there is no reason why equally good results can not be obtained in the United States. Our soil and climate excel those of Germany; our fertilizers are cheaper; our mechanics and manufacturers are more ingenious and skillful and either have or will perfect machinery that can supplant the drudgery of the cheap hand labor in the field in Ger-

many. Our methods of distribution are superior, and the markets for this whole product are close at hand.

With the development of beet-sugar cultivation and the manufacture must equally go a diversified cultivation in all lines of agriculture. Farmers do not and will not grow sugar beets alone. The pulp from which the saccharine juice is expressed will be used for food for cattle, hogs, and for fertilizing. Other by-products are utilized to reduce the net cost of sugar to consumer and profits to the manufacturer. The Agricultural Department reports that at least 22 States of the Union are equally as well adapted as Germany to the cultivation of beet sugar.

PROTECTION NEEDED.

But it will necessarily require from five to ten years of expensive experimentation and experience in the treatment of soils, fertilizers, and the handling of products, and many other incidents before refined sugar can be produced within the lowest limit of cost. If there be one article of American production which now deserves the application of the protective principle of Republicanism, it is the beet-sugar industry of the United States.

It is the one article in which the American farmer may become interested. It is the one article which he can produce and for which a vast market awaits him at his own door. But its successful development would necessarily throw the sugar trust out of business. If the sugar consumed in the United States could be produced in our factories from the products of our own farms it would require more than 600 different factories, with a capitalization of over \$350,000,000, and pay out more than \$100,000,000 annually to the farmers and wage-earners of the country.

BEET SUGAR IN MINNESOTA.

No State is better adapted to this culture than is Minnesota. At the Buffalo Exposition in 1901 the sugar beets from Minnesota received the highest prize for greatest excellence. Their saccharine test was 17.8 per cent—considerably higher than the average of the German beet. If Minnesota produced the sugar consumed within her own borders there would be required 30 factories, with a capitalization of over \$15,000,000 and paying out over \$5,000,000 annually to our farmers, mechanics, and laborers.

SUGAR-TRUST OPPOSITION.

It is this condition of affairs that the sugar trust desires to avert. It desires to perpetuate its monopoly upon the American people, from which it annually draws a profit of nearly \$25,000,000. The plants which now compose its vast system have not cost more than \$30,000,000. They are capitalized at about \$135,000,000 and pay an annual dividend on this immense watered stock of more than 7 per cent annually. They have commenced and encouraged this sentiment on behalf of aid for suffering Cuba.

PURPOSES OF TRUST.

They desire to accomplish two purposes. First, to purchase the Cuban raw sugar cheaper, so their direct profits could be increased, and, second, to create such an agitation as should deter capital from enlisting in the production of beet sugar. For these purposes an expensive lobby has been maintained in Washington all winter. Expensive pamphlets have been prepared, newspaper articles have been furnished wherever they could be used, a bureau of publication has insidiously worked upon the generous sentiments of the American people to incite sympathy for the "distressed" Cubans.

The course of stock of the American Sugar Refining Company on the New York Stock Exchange clearly shows the effect of this legislation. In January, when the agitation commenced, common stock was quoted at 115 to 117. As favorable prospects for the passage of the bill increased the price of the stock likewise increased, going as high as 135 per share. Whenever the prospects of the bill were doubtful the stock correspondingly fell, and in every case the reasons for the shifting prices were given that the results of this Cuban legislation directly affected the value of this stock of the sugar trust.

GAINS OF TRUST.

Colonel Bliss, the collector of customs at Habana, in his testimony stated that he thought about 30 per cent of the concession would be received by the Cuban planters. Mr. Pepper, the well-informed American correspondent in Cuba, estimated that 50 per cent of this concession would be received by the planters. The rest would be absorbed by the merchants and the sugar trust, because the sugar trust has practically a monopoly of cane-sugar refining in the United States, is the only customer for the Cuban product, and at its will can dictate terms to the sugar raisers of Cuba. The result of this legislation will be evident. The present crop season has practically expired. Of a crop of nearly 900,000 tons, less than 5 per cent of it has been up to this time imported into this country. The balance is held in Cuba either by rich merchants or by the sugar trust. Six months must elapse before this legislation can take effect. The poor planter who really needs

assistance can not hold on to his crop. He must sell to the sugar trust, for there is no other customer. The result will be that out of the present crop the rich merchants, and the sugar trust will gain a profit of nearly \$6,000,000 by the passage of this bill. The poor planter who needs assistance will get practically nothing.

It is admitted by all witnesses that the price to the consumer will not be reduced by the passage of this measure; that the whole benefit from this concession will be received by those who do not need it. This failure to reduce prices to the consumer is strongly urged as a conclusive reason why the beet-sugar interests of this country will not be injured by the passage of this act.

A little reflection will show the fallacy of such a proposition. It is probably true that factories already established in favorable localities and under good management will not be greatly injured. And it will probably be true that a few more factories might be established in extremely favorable places and under extremely favorable circumstances.

BEET SUGAR INJURED.

There are only 41 beet-sugar factories now, and but few more can be expected to be constructed if this bill passes. These at the most would produce only from 7 to 10 per cent of our probable consumption of sugar. What every patriotic American should desire is that the greater part of the sugar consumed here should be produced here. It is admitted and conclusively shown by the reports of the Department of Agriculture that newly established beet-sugar factories in the United States can not produce for the first five years sugar less than from 4 to 5 cents per pound. Some of them average as high as 8 and even 9 cents per pound, and these are compelled to run at a great loss. Capital can not be enlisted in such enterprises unless it is assured that it will receive encouragement and protection from the National Government of sufficient amount and for a sufficient period to properly experiment with the soils, climate, and methods of production and by economies and experience overcome the period of loss and reduce the cost of beet sugar to a profitable basis.

Every capitalist who contemplates embarking in such an enterprise knows that a tariff must be high enough and must last long enough to enable him to survive that period of experimentation and preliminary experience and of serious losses.

CUBAN SUGAR.

He knows, too, that Cuba is the richest sugar-producing land under the sun; that less than one-fourteenth of her area has been cultivated; that she raised more than 1,054,000 tons of sugar per year, and has sugar land enough to easily produce all the sugar that is needed on the American continent. Whether it can be produced in Cuba and refined in the United States and sold in the United States cheaper than beet sugar can be produced and sold in the United States no one can now tell.

But beet sugar is entitled to its trial. Its friends insist that it can hold its own if given a fair chance.

These capitalists know that tropical cane sugar in Cuba is indigenous to the soil, is cultivated by cheap, ignorant, half-servile labor, and upon vast plantations. It does not require preliminary experience and experimentations as does beet sugar.

PRESENT AGITATION INJURES BEET SUGAR.

These capitalists and the sugar trust know that under these conditions and circumstances if they can now discourage the beet-sugar industry and prevent any considerable amount of capital enlisting in its production they can gradually stifle or control the present limited production and again monopolize the American sugar market completely. They know well that continued agitation for free Cuban sugar will accomplish this result. If this bill passes the House of Representatives with a 20 per cent concession, they will start an agitation for a 33½ per cent concession in the Senate. After they have received that the Cubans will have more distress, and the cries will go up for more reciprocal relations and that the concession must be increased to 50 per cent.

The Cuban planters are demanding this now. General Wood and other Cuban officials are sustaining this demand. The chambers of commerce of several of our cities and many American newspapers are urging that 50 per cent be granted. If 50 per cent shall be granted, then the same agitators, the same influences, will demand absolute free trade with Cuba, and they expect that the same men who have yielded to 20 per cent will yield to 33, then to 50 per cent, and then to the free admission of Cuban raw sugar. The agitation and influence that has been powerful enough to work up this great sentiment in its favor among the American people and with the American press can be depended upon to continue that sentiment until it achieves its desired results.

HAWAII AFFECTED.

It is the fear of this agitation and of these influences and these results that will deter capital from enlisting in beet-sugar production in this country, and that will finally ruin the beet-sugar

business. Governor Dole, of Hawaii, in an interview in the Washington Star of April 10 last, makes the following significant statement:

The uncertainty as to the action of Congress toward Cuba has had some effect. It has injected an element of uncertainty as to the future in sugar prices, and it has also affected the value of plantation shares.

If such be the effect in Hawaii with its industries so well established and profitable, it can be appreciated how much greater it will affect the beet-sugar interests of the United States. The time to save that industry to the American farmer is right now. The way to save it is to defeat this measure and notify the American sugar trust that the American Congress proposes to protect this infant industry and prevent a monopoly by the sugar trust of the American market.

WESTERN FARMERS PROTECTIONISTS.

The Western farmer stood by the cradle of protection. He has supported it through evil as well as through good report, and by his support that principle has accomplished the beneficent results that we now see all over the land.

We have become the greatest manufacturing nation in the world, because the American farmer had the wisdom and patriotism to do his share in forming and sustaining a governmental policy that has developed these vast industries. And now with indignation he beholds these same industries, fattened with the fruits of his sacrifices, still demanding and receiving the enormous protection which they may have needed in the earlier years, now selling their goods cheaper to his foreign competitor than they do to himself. And the American farmer further knows that the extreme protection which has been received and is now enjoyed by many of the manufacturing interests of the East has caused and will cause retaliatory tariffs by European countries against our agricultural products.

He knows that when Europe discriminates against American products it is the agriculturists always who are injured. But he has stood all this patiently and without rebellion.

WESTERN FARMER INJURED.

Yet now he finds the Eastern highly protected manufacturer falling in with this agitation for the sugar trust, ready to menace if not to ruin the industry of the Western farmer for the sake of a possible slight increase in the export of Eastern manufactured goods. He finds the Eastern industries ready to imperil an infant Western interest to obtain some slight advantage to themselves. The American farmer and the Western Republican is ready and anxious to stand his share of any reduction that may be necessary in the schedules of a general tariff revision. If the tariff on iron and steel, glassware, wood pulp, lumber, crockery, the textiles, shall be reasonably reduced, he can fairly consent that a like reduction be made on agricultural products. But he demands that this reduction be not made on agricultural products alone. If an Eastern monopoly must be encouraged by law, he demands at the same time that other monopolies be compelled to yield part of their profits to the people who pay the bills.

REVISION OF TARIFF.

These Eastern interests loudly and strongly denounce any revision of the tariff, because it would disturb their particular business. Their influences have defeated the ratification of the treaties with France, Canada, and other countries, because competition would be increased with their products. Yet now they are ready and anxious to revise the tariff on the one particular industry affecting the farmer and compel him to pay the price which may advance their own interests. The people of the West protest against this discrimination and outrage. They would welcome a reduction in tariff schedules, but want all interests treated equally and fairly and at the same time.

EXPECT PROTECTION FOR BEET SUGAR.

We expect to continue under the banner of protection the contest for the establishment of the sugar industry in the United States.

We believe in a system that shall produce all the sugar that may be needed for our people upon the fertile fields and farms of the great and growing West; that shall manufacture it in the smaller communities, scattered all over our country, and by the labor of the high-priced, free, intelligent American citizens who here make their homes, rear their families, bear our burdens, and are benefited by the influences of our American civilization.

I do not believe an industry with such capabilities should be sacrificed to an odious monopoly of one of the principal food products, to be raised in a foreign land, under tropical skies, by cheap, half-servile labor, who never can approach the standard of American citizenship, and never use much of the products of American industry, and to be distributed and controlled in this country by a corrupt and greedy monopoly like the sugar trust.

The West will continue this contest, and believes that the sober

sense of the American people will sustain its protection and development. It asks no discrimination above that of other industries and of other interests. It will gladly yield its share of reduction when the time comes for a scaling of our tariff schedules, that our trade with all the peoples of the world may be increased; that the burdens of our own people may be lightened, and the development of every national resource be encouraged. [Loud applause.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the annexation of Cuba, and shall endeavor to make clear the grounds for my belief; and may I not hope that they will enter the heart and mind of the gentleman from Nevada and find a responsive echo as he presses for annexation?

I deny that Cuban annexation, either by invitation or pressure, is democratic or American, as she is entering the threshold of independence as a republic. Statesmanship should not go out of its way to secure incorporation.

No one questions the Americanism or the Democracy of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] or his ability to serve with honor on the Ways and Means Committee. But as he differs with all his Democratic colleagues on that committee and, as I believe, with nearly all his Democratic colleagues on the floor, I may be privileged to give the cause of my dissent from his proposition of Cuban annexation.

I like sunshine, optimism, and enthusiasm. I love to see the rosy early morning sunshine kiss the Dome of the Capitol, paint it with golden, and make it look glad. I would have it enter this Chamber and shed its radiance as the solons meet to deliberate on grave questions of state. I would have it enter their hearts and touch them up. I like sunshine, optimism, ardor, and enthusiasm when not over exuberant and when not misplaced; but, sir, I am filled with astonishment when my friend, with an optimistic smile, apparently oblivious to his American surroundings, with an enthusiasm worthy of a better cause, asks us to inflict another disaster on labor here and on his countrymen, and another misfortune to his country.

If statesmanship ever looked for annexation years ago, it was in the time of slavery, when labor of that kind could be availed of. The change in that respect has changed conditions entirely.

It was at a time when Spain was the possessor of a large portion of the Western Continent, when she possessed Cuba, and when wise statesmanship could foresee the dangers and turmoils that subsequently came.

Were they not wise?

But conditions have changed.

Republics have been erected in the Western World. Cuba aspires to the highest ideal of Americanism—liberty.

Will the gentleman be the first to deny it? Will he crush her aspirations and bring her in lieu under the dominion of a country which he asserts is tyrannically crushing out the liberty of others? The gentleman says it is sentimental legislation, this attempt of ours to aid Cuba to aid herself among the nations of the world.

Is there not some shade of the sentimental in the gentleman's break away from his colleagues in this veiled attempt to crush out the liberty of the Cuban republic? The statesmen who wanted to annex Cuba under different conditions were justified and were wise. To-day it is ill advised.

If Cuba had been annexed fifty or one hundred years ago, the unfortunate and un-American pages of our history of the last few years in the Orient would never have been written.

The effort to annex Cuba now, though it be under the veil of the mild but, to the Cubans at least, unentrancing resolution of the gentleman, will not detract the Democracy from its duty.

I was pained to hear the gentleman, in answer to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], give as a cardinal reason for annexation that Cuba was the richest island in the world.

This favors so much of the reasons given by the imperialists for holding in subjection the Philippines that it does not sound harmonious on this side of the House. Of course, the gentleman stated that Cuba is capable of supporting 13,000,000 of people, and were the conditions favorable, with the present population there of only 1,500,000, there is room for 11,500,000 more. For this surplus of American population I had thought the gentleman had an expedient in his arid-land projects, but he may be intending to abandon those with this new field for exploitation.

The gentleman does not seem to hear the wails of his people, or he heeds not their piteous cry, as they are wafted to Congress across the Pacific from Hawaii, that he voted to annex as a "coast defense" 2,600 miles away. Let me ask the gentleman to read their long and earnest petition for relief, filed in the Senate on April 8, and to be found on page 4040 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These appeals of mechanics must be heeded or a day of reckoning may come.

They ask for protection, patriotically ask for true American pro-

tection against the cheap cool labor and semicontract labor conditions that subsist and flourish on those islands.

Who knows how many of these 319 petitioning mechanics out of the total of 5,000 Americans on the islands may have been seduced to go there by the dulcet eloquence of the gentleman as he pleaded, on June 13, 1898, in this forum for the annexation of Hawaii, one-tenth of the circumference of the world away from our Western shore? The gentleman's policy of annexation was not Democratic doctrine then; his policy of Cuban annexation is not Democratic doctrine now.

I do not question the gentleman's consistency since he admits the parallel of Hawaii and Cuba as concerns annexation. The gentleman is fortunate that he did not then and does not now stand for his party. I know that his resolution before embarrassed some of his colleagues then, but in view of recent disclosures in governmental affairs and labor conditions none can be embarrassed now. The gentleman says he does not believe in sentimental legislation.

Was there not something sentimental in the annexation of Hawaii?

Is not something real and sentimental necessary to protect Americans, then, against the hordes of Orientals admitted to compete, and their descendants, and against the Orientals who came to Hawaii since annexation?

On annexation it was promised that a vast field was opened up for the profitable and remunerative employment of American labor. How roseate the promise, how futile the performance. Orientals are driving American workmen from the farm and the factory. The negro will do it in Cuba, with all your safeguards. The gentleman must remember that social equality is the rule among the races in Cuba, and he must reckon with that condition. What promises does the gentleman give for Cuba? It is a false conclusion as against the negro, but I quote it. He says:

The Cuban planters will gradually seek for white labor, and they will secure it among the Porto Ricans, the Italians, and the Portuguese.

Is that the best the gentleman can promise to American white labor? Does he not see and hear the protests of American workmen fast flowing to Congress against this very class of competition? Does the gentleman approve of it?

The gentleman says that "sentiment" should not prevail with legislators; but may we not ask the gentleman to aid his American countrymen against the orientals and those who come from the south and east of Europe?

In his speech he said that labor conditions had improved in Hawaii. I deny that it has from the American standpoint.

In the year of annexation, 1898, cool labor from the Orient was paid in Hawaii from \$15 to \$16 a month, board and clothe themselves; American labor \$18 a month on like conditions. The former slave contracts, the latter all but free.

The wages now are but a few dollars more a month than in 1898, and the advance in prices of necessities equals the raise. Now, what benefit has American labor reaped by annexation in matter of immigration to Hawaii? This table shows that Oriental laborers have increased by immigration to an alarming extent since our flag was raised over Hawaii. It shows the people on the islands in the respective years:

	1890.	1898.	Census 1900.
Japanese	12,360	25,000	61,111
Chinese	17,002	21,500	25,767
Hawaiians		39,000	37,918
Portuguese		15,000	
White			29,204
American		4,000	
British		2,250	
German and European		2,000	
Miscellaneous		1,250	
Total		110,000	154,000

The gentleman says that the labor condition is getting better in Hawaii. The figures irrefragably show the reverse. It is getting worse and worse. It will continue to do so. It is proven by the appeals of Americans for relief; it is proven by the immigration figures. If the gentleman seeks to justify annexation in the interest of American labor he will find his pathway so beset as to be dangerous; his course of argument will be so devious, so interminable, and so tortuous that he will meet himself a number of times coming back.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House to the petition filed from Hawaii on the 8th of this month in the Senate.

To the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States of America, greeting:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, do hereby represent—
First. That the present and future prosperity of this nation depends in a

great measure on the maintenance of the present high standard of living of its inhabitants.

Second. That this standard can not be maintained if the sphere of the American mechanic is invaded by the hordes of Asia, whose mode of life enables them to live comfortably on a sum which to an American would be a mere pittance.

Third. That at present fully 75 per cent of all the labor of the Hawaiian Islands, both skilled and unskilled, is being performed entirely by Orientals.

Fourth. That practically all the labor, both skilled and unskilled, which has been performed on buildings and grounds in this Territory for the Federal Government has been and is still being performed entirely by Japanese and Chinese, to the entire exclusion of competent American mechanics, who, by reason of these conditions, are at present forced into almost complete idleness.

Fifth. That the population of the Hawaiian Territory is 150,000, of whom the Chinese and Japanese number nearly 87,000, the Americans about 5,000, and the natives 57,000.

Sixth. That by rigidly excluding all Orientals from this Territory and from the United States conditions would soon become such that American citizens would be enabled to earn a living for themselves and families, which they are now practically unable to do on account of the deplorable and entirely un-American conditions now existing here.

Seventh. That, for the reasons above set forth, your petitioners earnestly ask that suitable legislation be framed the results of which would be—

First. The complete exclusion of both Japanese and Chinese or their descendants from American territory.

Second. The requirement that all labor of every description whatsoever which is performed for the Federal Government shall be done by, and only by, citizens of the United States.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

The gentleman would not wait till Cuba knocks at our door for admission. She can not in a hundred years become a State in the Union. If she remains a territory, as she must, all considerations that flow from precedents, law, and policy dictate the wisdom of keeping her out. This will be so till conditions change, conditions which to me seem impossible of change.

There, Mr. Chairman, is the situation that prevails in Hawaii. That stands here as a shining example of annexation under the resolution of the gentleman who repeats it on the subject of Cuba.

Let me see what the gentleman on the 8th said on this subject:

I am opposed to any concessions to Cuba unless they are accompanied by a cordial invitation to Cuba to become a part of the United States.

By this I understand the gentleman to say that unless this bill bears an invitation to Cuba to enter the Union, he will vote against it, and vote against the protection to American labor that will come in some measure if our immigration and contract-labor laws are adopted by Cuba. The gentleman can not construe this bill into anything but an invitation to Cuba to agree with us. The gentleman would admit her and all her conditions—race, climatic, and labor—by a wholesale process, but would not grant a slight concession to her and a full concession to our labor.

The gentleman would give no reciprocity to Cuba, and would not advance any of the interests of American labor. His theory is, unless we invite them into the Union, force them into the Union, because that would be implied by the invitation; he would give no concession; he would make it wholesale or not at all. This I gather from his speech and report. His theory is that if a mule is heavily loaded down with a heavy sack of wheat, it will not do to take any of it off as he staggers along, or the mule would collapse. His theory is to put on another sack, and the mule will walk off all right.

So it is contended by his report; so it is contended in his speech. He insists upon giving no reciprocal relations, no benefits to Cuba. He would take away the invitation that the United States would give her by this bill to frame an agreement for reciprocity and give her 20 per cent concessions. He would not trade this for her safeguards to us in coolly labor restrictions, but at the same time he would throw the full force of 100 per cent against American labor by annexation.

The gentleman says, further:

While you speak of the distress of Cuba, it is not an existing distress; it is anticipated distress.

He admits that distress may prevail there, but declines to aid in its relief unless Cuban annexation goes with it.

The gentleman says our policy has been perfidious and hypocritical toward Cuba, and that we unjustly deprived her of just rights and powers under the Platt amendment. In this I agree. But we know that when Cuba sets herself up she can restore these powers. But the gentleman would not aid in this consummation, but would bring her under the full tyrannical rule, a partial exercise of which causes the gentleman to so bitterly complain.

Further on he says:

But when our immigration laws and contract-labor laws are applied to that island, when she becomes a part of the United States, when we can enforce them, and not leave them to be enforced by the people there, the immediate effect will be an increase in the price of labor, just as in the case of Hawaii.

What will we say to labor when we see and they feel the force of Cuba's labor condition if we fail to do all we can to keep out the Chinese, the Japanese, and the Italians and Portuguese, if we can get the consent of Cuba to do so on a reciprocal agree-

ment, and when she fills up, as has the gentleman's "gem of the Pacific," with nine-tenths of its inhabitants orientals and colored and others equally undesirable?

If Cuba elects to extend our labor laws (and it is purely a matter of full and free election and choice with her) it will be the clearest evidence that Cubans want 20 per cent reciprocal relations with us for their own benefit and for their industrial advancement.

Mr. Chairman, I deny that the price of labor has been increased appreciably in Hawaii by annexation or that it will be in Cuba by annexation. I stand firm on the proposition that we who voted against Hawaiian annexation did all our duty and are not responsible for the race and labor conditions resultant from the admission of the Hawaiian Islands, unfortunate as she is in such labor conditions as I have shown, and we will perform our full duty to labor, to our people, and to democracy when we oppose the admission of Cuba into the Union. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to reduce the tariff 20 per cent from the usual rates on goods, etc., coming from Cuba to this country, subject to the provision that Cuba will grant a reasonable reduction in its tariff rates on goods which we send from here there and will also adopt our immigration and Chinese-exclusion laws. I am in favor of the bill. I favor it largely for sentimental reasons. While it does not seem to me that we owe this to Cuba and that, therefore, in granting it we are not paying an obligation, yet we can afford to do this as a gift to that island. Through the instrumentality of this country Cuba will soon be a nation.

A few years ago we saw her bleeding and in distress close to our shores, suffering from what we believed to be the rapacity and the inhumanity of Spanish dominion, and we lifted our voice in protest to Spain because we thought that Cuba was receiving mistreatment from the Spanish Government. We threatened to intervene in the domestic quarrel between Spain and her Cuban colony. We did this with full knowledge that war between our country and Spain was almost sure to follow. We held out to Cuba a helping hand of fellowship, knowing that that very act would make us use that very hand in fighting Spain.

We held out to the world and we said it to ourselves that we were thus intervening between Spain and Cuba wholly from methods of broad, sympathetic humanity, and not because of any selfish desire to become the possessor of the island of Cuba. Our country spent its treasure and its blood. The war cost us many lives and millions of money. Since the close of that war our Government has proceeded in an orderly manner in the island. Our officials there are soon to be withdrawn, to be succeeded by the republic of Cuba. We have kept faith with humanity.

But Cuba has suffered much for years. It was their suffering which caused the people of Cuba to commence their revolution against Spain, and during the period of that revolution their distress was naturally increased. If there had been no other disturbing causes except the war between Spain and Cuba, it could not be expected that the people of that island could yet have regained prosperity.

Cuba is probably the most fertile spot in all the world, but her great crop is cane sugar. Sugar is now suffering from an unexampled depression in price. The beet-sugar countries of Europe, through the system of bounty payments, have so enormously increased the production of sugar that the supply in the world to-day far exceeds the consumption, even at the present low prices. The European countries recognize this fact and have only recently entered into an international agreement providing that bounty payments for the raising of beet sugar shall cease by September 1, 1903.

Cuba finds her market for sugar in the United States. That sugar to-day has to pay a tariff when it enters our country, which amounts to nearly as much as the cost price of the raw sugar in Cuba. It is admitted, I believe, that the Cuban people can not raise sugar at a profit and sell it at the prices now prevailing in that island. And the question presented to us is whether by this bill we will take 20 per cent off the tariff for two years' time. That is all the bill proposes. It is estimated that the total reduction in the tariff through this 20 per cent cut will amount to seven or eight million dollars for each of the two years.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is being bitterly opposed. During my short term in this House I remember no other measure which has been fought with such bitterness and such tenacity. The contest over this bill has split wide open the Republican membership of this House as well as the Democratic membership. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this bill illustrates one of the peculiarities of selfish human nature. Before we commenced the war with Spain we passed a bill in the House by a unanimous vote placing \$50,000,000 in the hands of President McKinley to use as he might please in preparing for a possible conflict with Spain in our efforts to relieve the distress of Cuba.

We went to war and we spent money almost without limit and

spilled blood without fear. When we were willing to do so much for Cuba to relieve her from distress then, before our Government had assumed any moral or national obligations to that island, one might naturally think that we would now be willing to relinquish without question the payment of \$15,000,000 in tariff duties to relieve her present distress. If we were justified in going to war to deprive Spain of her dominion over Cuba, it seems to me we are more than justified in doing something for her now.

Cuba is close to our shore. Her prosperity or her distress will depend upon us, and is a matter of great importance to us. We can not expect or hope for a stable, prosperous government there unless her people are prosperous. They can not be prosperous unless they can sell to us their products at a fair profit.

I was originally opposed to any interference by this Government in the Cuban situation. But when it reached the point where every dictate of the human conscience forced us to take a hand, I then favored speedy action. A similar condition confronts us now. Gentlemen may argue about our duty to our own people and our lack of duty to the Cuban people, but the fact remains that the distress of Cuba will continue unless we grant relief through a bill like this.

We ought to do it, and I believe that the conscience of this Congress will coincide with the conscience of the President and of the people generally throughout our country, and will cause us to again reach out our hand to help the struggling people of that island in their hour of need.

The people of our country are to-day the most prosperous people in the world. With the return of the Republican party to power, with the reestablishment of a proper protective tariff schedule, with the decision of our country in favor of a sound standard of money, and with the renewal of confidence in our land, there came a prosperity in business which is unexampled elsewhere on the globe.

We do not need a tinkering with the tariff at present. There ought to be no unsettlement of business, which would surely follow an attempt at a general revision of the tariff at this time. But without attempting to revise the tariff schedule, we can, through this bill, be more than just to the Cuban people; we can, without injury to ourselves, be generous to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. The Chair inadvertently omitted to put the question. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House bill 12765 and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I asked this morning unanimous consent for leave to print on this bill, to continue for three days until after the bill was finally disposed of. I understand the gentleman from Michigan withdraws his objection, and I renew the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that leave to print on the pending bill be given for three days until after the bill is disposed of. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that, but I suggest to the gentleman that he make it five days instead of three.

Mr. PAYNE. Very well, Mr. Speaker; I will ask for five days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York modifies his request from three to five days. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I submit the bill (H. R. 13627) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union as in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, asks that the urgent deficiency bill just reported may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1902, and for other objects hereinafter stated, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE.

For contingent expenses of the Executive Office, including stationery therefor, as well as record books, telegrams, telephones, books for library, miscellaneous items, and furniture and carpets for offices, care of office carriage, horses, and harness, \$3,000.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

To defray the cost of canceling documentary stamps imprinted on checks, drafts, and other instruments, where the return of such instruments is demanded by the owners, and all necessary expenses incident to such cancellation, including room rent, drayage, and boxing, to be disbursed under the direction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, \$15,000, to remain available during the fiscal year 1903.

SENATE.

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, \$15,000.

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers to committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page, \$20,000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

For fuel and oil for heating apparatus, \$7,200.

PRINTING AND BINDING.

For printing and binding for the Department of Justice, \$6,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask whether we are to have a deficiency bill every week.

Mr. CANNON. I hope not.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. We had one last week, and we have had bills of this kind, it seems to me, nearly every week during this session. There are now about 12 gentlemen present on the other side of the House, and I have counted just 38 on this side. It does seem that if we are to have these bills brought in for action they ought to be called up in a full House.

Mr. CANNON. One word in reply to the gentleman. The question which the gentleman from Tennessee has just asked I asked of myself and of members of the committee with quite as much emphasis as the gentleman has asked it now; but I am informed by a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that, owing to investigations which are being carried on over there, they are absolutely out of money. The request for an appropriation of \$35,000 for such expenses and for miscellaneous items came to us for the first time to-day. As to the item for the Department of Justice, in reply to a vigorous inquiry on the part of the committee why the estimate had not come in before, we were told that it had been neglected and the Department was out of money for such expenses. Then there is the item for fuel and oil for the House of Representatives, \$7,200. We asked with some vigor why it had not been brought in before, and the reply was, "Oh, well, we did not know about it." So there you are. I have no apology to make. I report the bill by direction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PAYNE. I notice one item in the bill that came from the Committee on Ways and Means—the item of \$15,000 for canceling documentary stamps imprinted on checks, drafts, etc. This appropriation ought to be made; indeed it ought to have been made before.

Mr. CANNON. As a member of the House and the committee, I am to blame for the delay in regard to that item. As to the propriety of the legislation, I express no opinion; but it is a matter which ought to have been included in a former urgent deficiency bill; and I will say frankly to my friend from Tennessee it would have been had I not overlooked it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is very unusual for the gentleman from Illinois to make a mistake or an oversight. For myself, I feel that these deficiencies ought to be carried in the general deficiency bill; and did it not appear that several of these items are urgent, I should have objected. But I will not object.

Mr. CANNON. They are all urgent, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. But there ought not to be a deficiency bill passed here every week.

Mr. CANNON. We passed some time ago a deficiency bill which in the main was intended as the deficiency bill for the session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution without amendment:

House concurrent resolution 47.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President be requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 11418) to increase the pension of Hannah T. Knowles.

HANNAH T. KNOWLES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States; which was read, as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 12th instant (the Senate concurring), I return herewith House bill No. 11418, entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, April 14, 1902.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 11418) entitled "A bill granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles," with the accompanying message of the President, be transmitted to the Senate by the Clerk, with the request that the Senate reconsider its action in passing the bill, in order that the bill may be amended as follows:

Change the title so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Hannah T. Knowles."

Change the initial letter in name of the deceased sailor from "T" to "M," so as to read: "William M. Knowles."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It seems to me this is a most unusual resolution. I do not know that I have ever known a resolution of this kind to be passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this has been done once before this session. It is the usual procedure in a case of this kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understood the message from the President was a veto message.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. For the information of the gentleman from Tennessee, I will say that the President returns this bill to the House in response to a resolution requesting its return for the purpose simply of amending the title and changing a letter in the name of the deceased sailor. It is a bill granting a pension to a widow.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Simply changing the name?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Changing the middle letter of the name of the deceased sailor. In addition to that, the bill read "granting an increase of pension," when it should have read "granting a pension."

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Then the corrections are entirely technical?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Altogether so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this is not a veto message, but is a message returning a bill in pursuance of a resolution requesting such return. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and adopted.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7675. An act to construct a light-house keeper's dwelling at Calumet Harbor.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1178. An act providing for an additional circuit judge in the second judicial circuit.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 4535. An act granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Granger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

WASHINGTON GASLIGHT COMPANY.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file the views of the minority on the bill (H. R. 13405) authorizing the Washington Gaslight Company to purchase the Georgetown Gaslight Company, and for other purposes, reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to file the views of the minority on the bill H. R. 13405, which the Clerk will report by its title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill authorizing the Washington Gaslight Company to purchase the Georgetown Gaslight Company, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the views of the minority will be filed with those of the majority.

There was no objection.

COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS.

At the request of Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, unanimous consent was granted to withdraw the report on the bill (H. R. 10159)

to give the commandant of the Marine Corps the rank of major-general, for the purpose of correcting a verbal mistake.

Then (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), on motion of Mr. PAYNE, the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Surgeon-General, Marine-Hospital Service, submitting an estimate of appropriation for quarantine station at Portland, Me.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9206) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of any State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine, and to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, reported the same with amendments to the amendments of the Senate, accompanied by a report (No. 1602); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7642) to amend "An act to create a third division of the district of Kansas for judicial purposes, and to fix the time for holding court therein," approved May 3, 1892, and repealing all acts and parts of acts in conflict therewith, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1603); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4798) to authorize the Quincy Railroad Bridge Company, its successors and assigns, to rebuild the draw span of its bridge across the Mississippi River at Quincy, Ill., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1604); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12597) to ratify and confirm an agreement submitted by the Kansas or Kaw Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1608); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAVIDSON, from the Committee on Railways and Canals, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 42) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to examine and report upon a route for the construction of a free and open waterway to connect the waters of the Chesapeake and Delaware bays, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1610); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4749) granting an increase of pension to Eunice A. Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1563); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1037) granting an increase of pension to Helen A. B. Du Barry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1564); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1629) granting an increase of pension to James W. Humphrey, reported the same

without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1565); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10462) granting a pension to Mary A. Munson, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1566); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12107) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin T. Wells, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1567); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13132) granting an increase of pension to Annie Cotter, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1568); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12978) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Smith, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1569); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3217) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dixon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1570); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2971) granting an increase of pension to Silas D. Strong, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1571); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3820) granting an increase of pension to Warren B. Nudd, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1572); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4740) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Godfrey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1573); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4658) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Rand, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1574); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4056) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Melton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1575); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12015) granting an increase of pension to E. T. Daniels, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1576); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13017) granting an increase of pension to James Austin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1577); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13162) granting an increase of pension to Augustin M. Adams, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1578); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13352) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Brown, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1579); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7779) granting an increase of pension to William Belk, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1580); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3678) granting an increase of pension to John Washburn, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1581); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1643) granting an

increase of pension to Ellen J. Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1582); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3108) granting an increase of pension to Inez E. Perrine, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1583); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4514) granting an increase of pension to Mary Beals, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1584); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1625) granting an increase of pension to Jethro M. Getman, alias James M. Getman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1585); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3472) granting an increase of pension to Zeno T. Griffen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1586); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3519) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Cummings, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1587); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2943) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Rowan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1588); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13554) granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Hicks, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1589); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12008) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Coyle, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1590); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11748) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Ashmore, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1591); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9569) granting an increase of pension to Albert Deits, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1592); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7840) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Kerr, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1593); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 324) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Loucks, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1594); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3633) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Leffingwell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1595); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1814) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Luke, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1596); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 665) granting a pension to Laura Newman, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1597); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1014) granting a pension to Laura Lavensaler, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1598); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1363) granting

an increase of pension to James A. McKeehan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1599); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4111) granting an increase of pension to Abner J. Pettee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1600); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4335) granting an increase of pension to John Brown, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1601); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10921) for the relief of Charles A. Cutler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1605); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2413) for the relief of Frank J. Burrows, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1606); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 169) for the relief of Robert D. McAfee and John Chiatovich, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1607); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13082) for the relief of the estate of Sven J. Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1608); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13584) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Searcy—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13579) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo B. Fish—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 13599) authorizing a survey to be made for the selection of a site for a military post in the vicinity of Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 13600) relating to the appointment of dental surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 13601) providing for the alteration and repair of the public building at Dayton, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 13602) for the extension of Le Droit avenue and other streets—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 13627) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes—Ordered to be printed.

By Mr. BURLESON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 177) providing for the printing of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MUDD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 178) postponing the payment of taxes on real estate in the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1903 from November, 1902, to May, 1903, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 49) providing for the printing of 1,000 copies of Preliminary Description of the Geology and Water Resources of the Southern Half of the Black Hills and adjoining regions in South Dakota and Wyoming—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LACEY: A resolution (H. Res. 209) extending the privileges of the floor of the House to the commissioner from Porto Rico—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: A resolution (H. Res. 210) instructing the Committee on Ways and Means to report within ten days a bill removing all duty on imported beef—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13603) for the relief of the estate of Kinchen Bell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 13604) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Rubin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13605) for the relief of George A. Detchemendy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 13606) granting an increase of pension to David Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 13607) for the relief of W. B. Stanford, Roswell, Colo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 13608) granting an increase of pension to Elvira M. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 13609) for the relief of Henry Knisely—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 13610) for the relief of John A. Bishop—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13611) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13612) granting a pension to Margaret Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13613) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 13614) granting an increase of pension to William H. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 13615) granting an increase of pension to James A. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13616) granting a pension to Joseph Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 13617) granting a pension to Anne M. Luman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13618) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHEA of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13619) for the relief of James B. Franklin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 13620) granting an increase of pension to John R. Teague—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 13621) granting an increase of pension to Arison Greeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13622) granting an increase of pension to George Deland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 13623) for the relief of Peter Larsen—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 13624) granting a pension to Louisa Phillips—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 13625) granting an increase of pension to Vatchel Carman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 13626) for the payment to C. Edward Artist, Edward F. Stahle, and Stahle & Artist of balances due for surveying public lands—to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of R. B. Hawkins Division, No. 114, Order of Railway Conductors, Pittsburg, Pa., in relation to House bill 11030—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of General George D. Bayard Post, No. 178, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution of the Buffalo Merchants' Exchange, of Buffalo, N. Y., opposing the proposal of the Mather Power Bridge Company for the erection of a bridge from the mainland to Grand Island, Niagara River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the same body, favoring House bill 8337 and Senate bill 3575, amending the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the same, favoring House bill 163, relating

to officers in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: Petitions of Federal Labor Unions No. 9816 and No. 9384, of Caseyville; Labor Union No. 9812, and Mine Workers' Union No. 993, of Nortons Gap, Ky., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. APLIN: Petition of St. Joseph's Polish Society, of Bay City, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill 16, for the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BELL: Resolution of the League of American Sportsmen, favoring the passage of House bill 10306, for the preservation of wild animals and game birds—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolutions of the National Encampment at Springfield, Ill., Spanish War Veterans, for allowance of travel pay from Manila to San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petitions of officers of Company A, Signal Corps, of the Texas Volunteer Guards, favoring House bill 11654, increasing the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania (by request): Resolutions of Colonel George F. Smith Post, No. 130, of Westchester, and Phoenixville Post, No. 45, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill No. 3067, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Resolutions of Lithographers' International Beneficial Association of the United States and Canada, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DEEMER: Resolutions of General Mansfield Post, No. 48; Colonel S. D. Barrows Post, No. 385; George Cook Post, No. 315, and George W. Moyer Post, No. 379, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Martha Proven and other citizens of Bellevue, Pa., favoring an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, report of the committee on foreign commerce and the revenue laws of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging the reduction of the tariff on the imports into the United States from the island of Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Evidence to accompany House bill 13094, granting an increase of pension to John Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, testimony to accompany House bill 10740, to amend the military record of Henry Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolutions of Harlow Briggs Post, No. 80, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, protesting against granting pensions to ex-Presidents or their widows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANBURY: Resolutions of the Eighteenth Assembly District Republican Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters' Union No. 639, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Resolution of Labor Union No. 8398, of Boonville, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Resolution of the League of American Sportsmen, favoring the passage of House bill 10306, for the preservation of wild animals and game birds—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: Resolutions of Federal Labor Union No. 8460, of Stippville, and Union No. 8454, of Independence, Kans., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOY: Coupon petitions of 1,075 readers of the St. Louis Evening Star, asking Congressmen to vote for House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Resolutions of Central Labor Union of Adams, Mass., and Boot and Shoe Workers' Union of Dalton, Mass., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of Loyal Lodge, No. 406, Association of Machinists, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring a reduction of not less than 50 per cent of

the duty on Cuban sugar and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEVIN: Resolutions of Lithographers Protective Beneficial Association, Coshocton, Ohio, for the exclusion of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of citizens of Alexandria, Va., protesting against the "Jim Crow" car law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Stuart Reed Lodge, No. 300, Association of Machinists, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of Mine Workers' Union No. 169, of McAdoo; Labor Unions No. 9182, of Ashland, and No. 8874, of Shenandoah, Pa., favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Oswald Bruckner and 126 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., on tariff and reciprocity—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Resolution of commissioned officers of the Second Regiment Connecticut National Guard, favoring House bill 9972, increasing the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of H. J. Kilroy and other citizens of Norwich, Conn., in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of New London Lodge, Association of Machinists, New London, Conn., for the exclusion of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Association of Waterbury, Conn., favoring an appropriation for a public building at Waterbury—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolutions of the Industrial Council of Pittsburg, Kans., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petition of John Brooks, for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THAYER: Resolutions of Boot and Shoe Workers' Union No. 52, of North Grafton, Mass., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Petition of Subordinate Association No. 19, of Lithographers' International Protective and Beneficial Association, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of T. D. Weld and others, of the Eighth Congressional district of Ohio, for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZENOR: Proof to accompany House bill 3005, for the relief of John Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 15, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received yesterday from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their respective titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 3592) for the relief of Henry Lane;

A bill (H. R. 9455) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Lorenzo Marchant;

A bill (H. R. 9723) granting an honorable discharge to Levi Wells; and

A bill (H. R. 11621) to correct the military record of H. J. Rowell.

The House pension bills received yesterday were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 8326) to set apart certain lands in the Territory of Arizona as a public park, to be known as the Petrified Forest National Park, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

SCHOONER GEORGE AND JANE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of